

---

## Paper 4 – Depth Study

---

### Question 2: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–1941

- 2 Evaluate the reasons for the failure of democracy in Italy by 1922. [30]

#### Mark scheme

- 2 **Evaluate the reasons for the failure of democracy in Italy by 1922.** [30]

What is expected here is an analysis of a range of reasons why the democratic process came to an end in Italy in 1922. There are many possible factors. The state was a new one and had undergone a long, brutal and costly war. Democracy had had little time to prove itself and Italy's social and economic divisions were deep. There was simply an absence of consensus about what the country's priorities were and how they could be solved. Italy had been invaded and humiliated by its old foe Austria, and the Italian people felt that they had been lured into the war under false pretences and never forgave the political class that they felt was responsible.

The structure of the state arguably was unsuited to the needs of the times, and the electoral system, while not causing instability, certainly reflected it. Too few saw a future in democracy and there were alternatives which offered a better future on both the left and the right. Many of the ruling class despised it. The influential Church not only gave it little support, but actively undermined it at times; it had not forgiven the state for the events which led up to 1871.

Democracy had few supporters and too many opponents. The Orlando's and Giolitti's were seen to be utilising the process for their own ends and it did not seem to provide the stability and order that the small farmer, the Church, the industrialist, the army and the King wished for. Fear of the Left was endemic amongst too many of the ruling classes and Mussolini proved to be brilliant at exploiting that fear.

Example candidate response – high

Q1 Evaluate the reasons for the failure of democracy in Italy by 1922.

Plan. (preserve the parliamentary system + unified Italy)  
The Liberal government's weaknesses + unpopularity

↳ Prior to World War II even => Libyan war 1911  
all for revolution ← alienate socialists + conservatives

↳ Post World War II => situation worse b/c ↑  
labour militancy, inflation, workers suffered  
=> Nitti's govt + Giolitti did not crack down, alienate industrialists + employers

OPEN CONFLICT - INSTABILITY.

↳ failure to remain in control => Mussolini's ability to create an effective alternative

↳ gain control of (Ras)

↳ Parliamentary alliance

↳ sabotaging the regime

↳ convincing that only fascists can

solve the problem (propaganda)

↳ Liberal govt's inherent weaknesses => divisions, no parties, no alliance

## Example candidate response – high, continued

In October 1922, the ~~liberal~~ king Victor Emmanuel, ~~was~~ supported by the liberal government and conservative elements invited Mussolini to become prime Minister of Italy. That the Liberal's invited the instrument of their own destruction into power in 1922 is testament to both the weaknesses of the liberal parliamentary regime as well as the strength of Mussolini and his <sup>government</sup> tactical manoeuvrings. The liberal ~~govt~~ sought to preserve parliamentary democracy, albeit of a limited form initially, but failed to do so ~~for several~~ because they lost mass support by the end of the world war, although they began losing support even prior to this, and because they fell prey to Mussolini's cunning genius. Additionally the liberal government was plagued by problems that existed since its inception. These weaknesses also played a role in the fall of the Liberal government. With the ~~liberal government out of~~ ~~the~~ way in Oct Mussolini in control by 1922, the parliamentary system in Italy began to witness its last days.

The liberal government began alienating itself and thus the parliamentary system as a whole even before the first world war. Ever since its inception the liberal government faced opposition from the left (radicals and anarchists) and from the right (nationalists and the church). The weakening of the economy during the premiership of Francesco Crispi and the collapse of big banks in 1893 created ~~movements~~



## Example candidate response – high, continued

led to protest movements by fasci demanding better pay, lower rent and better living conditions as a whole. Under his premiership Crispien attempted to bring socialists into the fold, however, this grand trasformismo was to end with the Libyan campaign of 1911-1912. The Socialists vehemently objected to the campaign and it was at this point that they began becoming revolutionary in flavour, demanding the overthrow of the liberal regime. In reaction to this, many conservatives blamed the liberal regime for not being leftist extremist. Under Crispien the government had decided it would remain neutral in labour disputes. The conservatives thus claimed that the liberal government was responsible for the peak in revolutionary socialism. ~~The~~ Nationalists, those who opposed the parliamentary regime as a whole, and believed that Italy needed strong authoritative government began to gain support. Thus even prior to the first world war, it can be seen that the popularity of the liberal regime was declining sharply and with it so too was the population's faith in the parliamentary democratic system.

Italy's entry into the first world war in 1915 was only to make things worse. The living and working conditions of workers during this period began to decline



## Example candidate response – high, continued

for a number of reasons. In order to fuel industry, workers were required to work longer hours and had less days off.

Additionally, in order to finance armaments, the government began to print more money.

This resulted in inflation and the workers saw ~~their~~ the value of their real wages together with their purchasing power decreased.

At the end of the war, these grievances coupled with a decrease in military discipline in factories to produce a rise in labour militancy. Along with

labour unrest more and more workers rushed to join the Socialist party. In

the elections of November 1919 the Socialist party established itself as the largest in the nation. Socialist unrest was

also spreading to the countryside, and agricultural trade union began to develop a stronghold over employment.

Despite this unrest the Liberal government continued to remain neutral in

these disputes and this greatly angered industrialists, land owners and all

those of a conservative leaning. In the absence of government intervention,

those of the right took it upon themselves to clamp down on

the socialist threat. In central and Northern Italy, fasci began a

programme of violence against the



## Example candidate response – high, continued

socialists, this violence continued throughout 1919 and 1920. The Liberal government was facing opposition from all sides and by 1920 its position was becoming increasingly precarious. The liberal government was unable to clamp down on the open violence in the countryside, nor could it assert its control. The final nail in the coffin for the parliamentary government however, would be Mussolini.

In 1919 Mussolini was the head of a rather insignificant party, fasci di combattimento. Initially socialist in flavour, Mussolini had since abandoned that program and instead attempted to create a movement for 'producers and combatants.' While Mussolini was not responsible for the outbreak of violence in 1919, he was able to take advantage of it. It was Mussolini who indeed transformed the fascist movement into an alternative ruling party that the liberal government ended up accepting, ~~to~~ and allowing into power. Initially Mussolini won the loyalty of the local fascist leaders (vass), by convincing them that he was the only one who could unite the fascists and create a <sup>proper</sup> respectable movement out of them. At the same time he began to convince the liberal regime that only the fascists could clamp down on the



## Example candidate response – high, continued

‘Bolshevik uprising; Mussolini took greater care to convince the liberals that he was not a radical. He would detach himself from the worst extremes of Squadristi violence and tell the liberals that ~~it~~ these responsible were renegades who Mussolini would discipline, however he could only discipline them if the liberal govt dealt with him. Thus Mussolini convinced the liberal government that firstly only the fascists could stop socialists, and second only Mussolini could deter radical fascists. These clever manoeuvres earned him an electoral alliance with Giolitti in May 1921. Following the alliance Mussolini cunningly manipulated his advantage of a parliamentary foothold to discredit the liberal regime. He encouraged fascist violence in order to create a breakdown of law and order so that the liberal government would be further blemished. Additionally he unified the fascist movement into a fascist political party so that it became a more cohesive body. He also won the support of the Church by stating that he opposed divorce and would work out the question of Rome on the Pope's terms. He won the support of industrialists and the right by dropping any



## Example candidate response – high, continued

element of the Socialist program he  
one espoused. Mussolini was also a  
brilliant propagandist and as editor of  
his newspaper *Il Popolo d'Italia* he  
would skilfully emphasize the strength  
of the fascists and the weaknesses of  
the liberal regime. In 1922 Mussolini  
shaved that he was determined to  
crush the socialist threat by cracking  
down on a general strike that  
broke out earlier that year. In doing  
all this Mussolini was able to create  
a compelling alternative to the liberal  
regime, to such an extent that even  
liberals themselves bought into it.

Aside from a general loss of  
popularity, the liberal government also  
fell due to a number of structural  
weaknesses which prohibited strong  
government. Even in 1922 there was  
no liberal political party, but just  
factions which frequently fell out  
amongst each other leading to governments  
falling apart. The liberals were also  
slow to adapt to the realities of  
universal suffrage and the fact that  
parliament was not longer just the  
presence of the liberals. Perhaps the  
liberals could have formed a strong  
government of the centre right had they  
formed an alliance lasting alliance with



## Example candidate response – high, continued

the poplain, however liberal tradition militated against such an alliance. Additionally the poplain also distrusted the liberals making such an alliance even more unlikely.

Thus by 1922, the Liberals had lost almost all support and many had begun to lose faith in the parliamentary system as a whole. The liberal ~~dream~~ hope to preserve parliamentary politics in Italy and democracy in Italy was to be only a piped dream when Mussolini came to power. In addition to losing support the liberal's fell victim to Mussolini's tactical mind as well as the weaknesses inherent in the Liberal system.

## Examiner comment – high

The opening paragraph is excellent and indicates that there has been careful thinking and planning before the writing started. It does not give too much detail or spend much time 'scene setting'. Instead it has a clear focus on the question and includes evaluation from the start. A very good range of relevant points are made, but with not too much detail early on. There is breadth and reflection in the impressive opening sections. The second paragraph is a good example of why this response did so well. The point about the early failings of the Republic is well made and backed up with well-chosen detail. There is a good level of comment throughout this section. The point about the impact of the war is well made, well substantiated and also relevant. The supporting detail about the role of Fascism in Central and Northern Italy, for example, demonstrates the right amount of knowledge and understanding for Level 5 in this 'Depth' paper. There is consistent evaluation throughout and this is well demonstrated in the critique of the Liberal Party towards the end of the essay. The candidate could have included some comment on Versailles.

To achieve full marks, the candidate could have used their own judgement to identify and rank the key factor(s) according to importance. Otherwise, this answer fully deserved Level 5.

**Mark awarded = 26 out of 30**

## Example candidate response – middle

Q2. The world by 1922 had drastically changed from what it was before the world war. In Italy, the liberal government suffered insurmountable obstacles in its governance which by the end of 1922 made it impossible for the democracy to survive and the liberals to flourish. The aftermath of the first world war, the incompetence of the liberal government, the menacing socialist threat and most importantly the rise of fascism and Mussolini were the reasons as to why the democracy failed by 1922.

After the first world war Italy had faced multiple problems. Firstly the gains they made in the war did not materialise and ~~areas such as Emilia were not given to~~ Moreover the cost of war had been enormous. 600,000 to 1 million soldiers had lost their lives and the ~~gold~~ foreign exchange reserves decreased at a rapid rate as keeping the soldiers fed and armed was exorbitantly expensive. Increased borrowing from the USA and Britain increased the national debt from 16 billion lire to ~~60~~ 85 billion. The Government introduced an increase in money supply to deal with the monetary crisis but it led to high amounts of inflation in which the purchasing power of consumers suffered.



## Example candidate response – middle, continued

and standard of living fell. Labor militancy rose and workers were frequently revolting for higher wages, shorter hours and better standards of living. These impacts of the World War had made life for the liberal government enormously hard and their inability to deal with these problems led to its fall in 1922.

Moreover the initial greatest enemy to the democracy was the Socialist threat. Socialist policy ~~stated~~ was staunchly against liberal views and radicalism was the major aim of the Socialists. Further problems arose when the Socialist influence in elections was extremely high. They won 130 seats in the parliament and had the power to be in complete opposition. Workers disillusioned with the inability of the government would come into the folds of socialism. In one major event engineering workers asking for higher wages took over a factory. When the employers complained to the government Giolitti decided to adopt neutrality saying that government intervention would lead to a bloodbath. The crisis did resolve in a month but the government was not forgiven for this incompetence.

The Socialist threat led to the rise of perhaps one of the strongest parties in Italian history, 'The Fascists'. Socialists had started on far practices of taking over lands and occupying factories, and became extremely violent. The industrialists and upper classes felt that the lower classes were in ascendancy and the government had



## Example candidate response – middle, continued

abandoned them. Some townspeople and landowners ~~asked~~ in Emilia and Tuscany asked a group of fascist squads assistance against the Socialists. These were ~~was~~ a disorganised group that had no coherent strategy and comprised chiefly of Ex army officers and NCO's. These squads were extremely effective in burning Socialist offices and beating up Socialist members. ~~They~~ More people turned to the fascists and it attracted many members of the middle class, Conservatives and nationalists and further took support away from the democracy. The success of the fascists was seen as a major political opportunity for one man who would soon become dictator of Italy. This man was Benito Mussolini. His aim was to move to the forefront of the movement and under the influence of his successful newspaper *Il Popolo* he would transform the image of the discordant parts to one of respect, unity and hope for the people of Italy. Mussolini now became active in fascist policies and greatly wanted to increase his primary aim of achieving absolute power. One major occasion in which his power was consolidated was when a large Socialist revolt took place. ~~He~~ Mussolini had said that if the government was unable to deal with this threat then the fascists would deal with ~~them~~ it themselves. ~~However~~ As the government ~~remained~~ did not do anything the fascists were instrumental in crushing the Soviets and gained further influence and isolated the



## Example candidate response – middle, continued

Democracy.

The naivety of the liberal government was another reason as to why it failed. Giolitti offered an ~~an~~ alliance with Mussolini hoping to get rid of the Socialist threat and after which he would either be absorbed into liberalism or be dispersed completely. Initially Mussolini agreed to this but soon he made it clear that he was going to be no-one's pawn. He effectively proved to the industrialists, Conservatives, middle classes and other institutions of the state how weak the democracy was and unstable governments were bound to fail. The March on Rome was to be a final nail in the coffin ~~was~~ for the liberal government. Mussolini gathered a 30,000 ~~rep~~ militia and it was sent to Rome. He had made it clear that fascism was no threat to monarchy and they could work together.

Fascists took control of the ~~the~~ telephone exchanges and opened Postal Services. ~~was~~ Facta government alarmed by this moved out to the King who accumulated his troops but inevitably did not retaliate to the march because he may have thought that the threat ~~to~~ was too large, or that his cousin Aosta would depose him or just because he was not fond of the liberal government and may have confided in Mussolini who brought promises of loyalty and stability.

Soon he ~~was~~ <sup>Mussolini</sup> made Prime Minister and inevitably he destroyed the democracy and emerged with a dictatorship in 1926. The ~~first~~ managed to

## Example candidate response – middle, continued

Lastly the democracy had lost the support of the popolari who were integral to the proper functioning of the government. Ciolitti had introduced a tax that reduced the Vatican's financial investments and the Pope chose not to support him anymore. Moreover Mussolini's conciliatory attitude with the Church though disagreeing with contraception and divorce did not necessarily make the Pope hate him. Inevitably the democracy had failed.

Therefore the Democracy failed by 1922 due to a ~~was~~ multiplicity of reasons namely the impact of the first world war, the uncontrollable Socialist threat and the sheer brilliance of Mussolini: whose primary aim for increasing his personal power was detrimental to the democracy by 1922.

## Examiner comment – middle

This is a competent answer which shows a good grasp of the topic but does not quite do what the question asked, which was to evaluate the reasons for the collapse of democracy in Italy. Much of the focus tends to be on why Mussolini got into power, which is not quite the same thing, although some of the material is appropriate. There is too much listing of factors and virtually no reflection on what part they played in the collapse of democracy and, above all, why. The second paragraph contains relevant detail but only some evidence of evaluation or reflection. Much the same can be said of the paragraph dealing with the socialist threat. The detail is good but the point being made is not always clear. Similar criticisms can be made of the sections on the rise of fascism and Mussolini himself.

For higher marks there would need to be more evidence that the candidate had really thought about why democracy had failed. Which were the key reasons and why? Was it 'doomed' from the start or was it the incompetence of those in leadership positions? Did Mussolini merely give an institution in terminal decline a small push, or was his accession to power solely the result of his own brilliant efforts? There is no 'right' answer, but the question was looking for more than a list of factors which might be considered.

**Mark awarded = 19 out of 30**



### Question 10: International History, 1945–1991

- 10 To what extent was the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan responsible for the onset of the ‘Second Cold War’? [30]

#### Mark scheme

- 10 **To what extent was the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan responsible for the onset of the ‘Second Cold War’?** [30]

In support of the view that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was responsible, it could be argued that it led to widespread condemnation of the USSR and, to the West, was viewed as evidence of the continuation of the expansionist aims of the USSR. In retaliation, the USA withdrew from the SALT II Treaty. US President Carter was unwilling to allow the USSR to get away with another intervention in the affairs of a foreign country – he cut off trade links with Moscow, encouraged a Western boycott of the Moscow Olympics in 1980 and increased US expenditure on arms (including nuclear weapons). Despite this, US public opinion saw Carter as weak in confronting the threat of communism, and he lost the 1980 election to Ronald Reagan, a staunch anti-communist right winger.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that the period of détente was effectively already over before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The USSR had continued to violate human rights agreements made at Helsinki, while Brezhnev’s failing health had done little to enhance US-Soviet relations. The development of renewed superpower hostility can be seen as early as 1976. Conservatism was regaining strength in the USA, and it viewed the increasing influence of the USSR in the Third World as further evidence of Soviet expansionism (e.g. Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia). Carter supplied US arms to anti-communist groups (e.g. El Salvador, Nicaragua) in an attempt to prevent the spread of Soviet influence. Opposition to SALT II was high in the US Senate well before the invasion of Afghanistan, and it already seemed unlikely that the USA would sign. When Islamic militants occupied the US embassy in Teheran (1979), American conservatives viewed this as evidence of the USA’s impotence in world affairs and argued that this needed to be addressed. Détente, therefore, was no longer seen as beneficial to either the USA or the USSR. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan could be seen as the event which started the ‘Second Cold War’ rather than its cause.

## Example candidate response – high

10 In order to answer the hypothesis, we must look at the two stages of détente. Firstly the Slow Down in Detente 1972-75 and then the Breakdown in 1975-79.

As early as 1972 President Nixon had been criticised for giving up the ideological struggle, for conceding superiority to the Soviets by signing the SALT 1 agreements 1972 and by granting legitimacy to a barbaric, government one which suppressed Jewish immigration, yet was still given 'most favourable nation' status in terms of trade. These accusations grew from the sporadic growth of Conservatism led by proponents such as Senator Henry Jackson. A man who would pass the Jackson-Vanik amendment 1975, stripping the USSR of the 'most favoured nation' despite its allowances to



## Example candidate response – high, continued

abolish an 'exit tax' and to permit the exit of "50,000" Jews in 1973, something which Jackson would refuse demanding an increase to 60,000 alongside making what was meant to be a private state discussion into a very public one, he did so by going to the press.

Indeed the slow Down may have been delayed, yet the Watergate Scandal weakened the President. Ford was only a stop-gap President and the Vladivostok 1974 agreement on ICBM and Parity and the capping of MIRVs to 1320 showed this. R

Factors outside the control of each governments also caused a breakdown in relations. The ~~its~~ ~~with~~ like Vienna Conference (1973-88) essentially broke down due to geographical asymmetry, in that if Soviet and American forces were reduced under Mutual and Balanced Force reduction, the Americans would be disadvantaged since they had the Atlantic preventing them from quick redeployment. Thus the Slow Down in Detente can largely be attributed to American Responsibility.

The ultimate Breakdown in Detente 1975-79 occurred due to many reasons. The SALT I alongside the SALT II Agreements (the latter never being ratified but still being practiced by the US government); many in the American public believed had conceded superiority to the Soviets. Indeed there were many loopholes in both agreements arising as well from an American as a Soviet desire to maintain their newly developed weapons such as the MIRVs and theatre nuclear weapons (SS-20s and



## Example candidate response – high, continued

Perishings which would be deployed in Europe, although it is important to note that a third of Soviet SS-20s were aimed at China due to growing antagonism). American opinion however failed to realise that the so called missile gap primarily arose due to Soviet military practice of not retiring their missiles, also American missiles such as the Trident II and Poseidon were far more accurate. Thus again, failures in communication and understanding led to a mutual accountability in damaging Detente. It is important to state here that Brezhnev's failing health did much to worsen Detente, the military council under Defence Minister Ustinov found it much easier to increase military budgets in this new situation.

Perhaps what many historians overlook is the fall of Willi Brandt from power in 1974, who's Ostpolitik initiative which propelled Detente forward was seriously damaged by his resignation arising from charges of espionage. The death of Mao and Prime Minister Zhou Enlai in 1976 also did much harm, no longer could the US pull the Russian lever and come to an agreement through discussion as opposed to force.

However, some fault is also to be borne by the Soviets who had seen the Helsinki accords of 1975 as a political tool to confirm Post war boundaries of Czechoslovakia, Poland and <sup>the</sup> Democratic Republic of Germany. In doing so Brezhnev felt that the Helsinki accords would further his popularity as a man of peace and deflate Soviet dissidents. However blatant



## Example candidate response – high, continued

disregard of Human Right and suppression of dissidents, albeit not using the full extent of Stalinist machinery, resulted in a body blow to Dekente. The American pressure came under huge pressure & in changing its policy to a more aggressive stance with regards to the Soviet Union.

Lastly it can be argued and indeed it is by many American historians that the Soviets used Dekente as a guise to further their influence in the third world. For example in 1975 North Vietnam would invade and conquer the South. Yet here we must remember American inability to see the Vietnamese conflict as one of nationalism, instead they saw it under the prism of the Cold War disregarding Soviet actions such as asking for North and South Vietnamese admittance to the UN in 1957, instead they regarded communism as a monolithic movement. Indeed Africa too can be argued as an example of Soviet expansionism, however Koo Breznev had already stated that actions in Africa should not change Soviet policy towards Dekente. Here too, it can be argued that the Americans never saw Dekente through a Soviet perspective whereby the latter used it as a means to decrease military expenditure or nuclear arms the ideological struggle for Communism however was to be never given up since it was the *raison d'être* of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). Indeed it can be argued that Cuban support for the MPLA only came after US support for UNITA and the FNLA. A similar misunderstanding can be seen in Nicaragua 1984-86 1973-79



## Example candidate response – high, continued

where again Nixon's policy of linkages come undone, indeed Carter too can be blamed it was he who initially cut off arms to the Somoza government allowing the Soviet backed Sandinistas to come in power 1979. Perhaps it is Afghanistan which proves the most interesting situation, strong pressure from conservatism which had risen in America cited the Afghan revolution as an example of impotence of US power. The same conservatism it can be argued could be found in Senate which would have never ratified the SALT II agreements. Moreover the Soviets were trying to prevent fratricidal fighting between the communist party by installing Babrak Karmal, their fears were only heightened by US-Chinese triangular diplomacy, and their own fear for the fall of Islamic states within the Soviet Union. Many argue that Brezhnev's Pincer movement was mere hypodesis to be used by Carter for re-election.

Detente by its very definition is between two parts the end of it thus is also a result of the actions of both parties, whose actions led to a cumulative process which ultimately led to the end of Detente through the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan 1979. Ultimately it would lead to Reagan's five brand of anti-communism, his use of SDI and the redevelopment of the ~~next~~ neutron bomb would lead to another era of increased antagonism. At the same time it is important to regard the effects of the rise in American conservatism with some High Historians claiming Detente ended as early as 1976, when as can be evidenced through



## Example candidate response – high, continued

Workers support for anti-Communist rebels in E.L.-Salvador.  
 Détente. This was broken through mutual action and  
 reaction and to single out any one event would be  
 unfair.

## Examiner comment – high

This was an impressive answer. It started with minimal background and kept everything very precisely on the central issue of détente. There was a brief, fully focused introduction. Initially, there was perhaps a little too much focus on the detail and the central argument did get a little obscured. However, by the second page, it was obvious that there was a consistently analytical focus. The comments on the other 'outside' factors were very perceptive and clear, and the way in which supporting detail was utilised was excellent. Overall the grasp of the topic and the level of understanding were impressive. The point about the ultimate breakdown was typical: clear, well-made and well supported with detail.

The objective of each paragraph and its key points were clearly stated and then the right level of supporting detail brought in. The 'blame' was spread wide, the Brandt issue being a good example of this. There was a good conclusion which did not simply repeat what went before. Arguably there could have been more focus on the impact of the election of Reagan. There could have been a little more use of sustained judgement as this would have helped to know exactly which factor the candidate felt was critical and why. Otherwise, this answer fully met the criteria for Level 5.

**Mark awarded = 29 out of 30**

**Question 12: International History, 1945–1951**

**12** How far was Nasser responsible for the outbreak of the Suez War of 1956? [30]

**Mark scheme**

**12 How far was Nasser responsible for the outbreak of the Suez War of 1956? [30]**

The view that Nasser was responsible for the war was held by Britain, France, Israel and, to some extent, the USA, who feared his aggressive support for Arab unity and independence. His organisation of sabotage raids inside Israel, his refusal to renew the 1936 treaty allowing British troops at Suez and his deals for Soviet weaponry from Czechoslovakia all caused alarm. When the USA cancelled its grant for the Aswan Dam, fearing that the USSR was seeking to gain control of the Middle East, Nasser nationalised the Suez Canal, intending to use its income to finance the dam. The West saw Nasser as a Hitler-like figure, who was planning to unite the Arab world under Egyptian control and Soviet influence. This posed a serious threat to peace in the Middle East, not least because Nasser had made no secret of his desire to destroy Israel.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that Britain and France were more responsible for causing the war. This was the opinion of the communist bloc, which accused Britain and France of imperialistic tactics. Britain, France and Israel planned for Israel to attack Egypt and remove Nasser from power, arguing that this was necessary to keep the Suez Canal open to international shipping. This ignored the fact that Nasser had promised to compensate shareholders and allow ships of all nations to use the canal.

Israel actually began the war by attacking Egypt, with notable success. The USA, afraid of upsetting the Arabs and forcing them into closer links with the USSR, refused to support Britain and France. At the UN, the USA and USSR agreed on the need for an immediate ceasefire and the withdrawal of Israeli troops. The Arab world blamed Israel for the war, seeing Nasser as the leader of Arab unity and the desire to remove foreign interference from the Middle East.



## Example candidate response – middle

Ans.12

Admittedly Nasser's responsibility for the ~~Suez War~~ was a key figure in the ~~end~~ Suez War and there is a case to be made that it the Suez Crisis boils down<sup>to</sup> the nationalization of the Suez Canal, that was indeed a decision Nasser made. However that was in no way an act of direct aggression, as the only reason he did so was as a means of retaliation towards the UK and France, who ~~ex~~ had cancelled the loans Nasser required to complete the Aswan dam project. ~~Granted~~ The legality of both actions dubious at best.

Furthermore, Israel may also be held accountable for consorting with Britain and France and aiding Egypt. Hence, as we can see, in terms of causation there were three main parties involved. However minor parties played a role as well, ~~the~~ ~~only~~ one of the main reasons that Britain and France ~~off~~ the world bank cut off funding for the Aswan Dam project was because Egypt was seen as a nation poised to ~~join~~ getting too close with the Soviet Union, a decision undoubtedly influenced by the American policy



## Example candidate response – middle, continued

of roll back and containment, ergo it may be argued that the root cause of the Suez Canal may have been ~~overwhelming~~ overwhelming antagonization of non-communist nations who were diplomatically friendly with the Soviet Union.

Furthermore one ~~can~~ could argue, that the Aswan Dam was only being built due to ~~Israel~~ Israeli agriculture and ~~irrigation~~ irrigation policy which served to diminish the amount of water

Egypt and Syria were going to use and hence necessitated a similar response from the Arab side.

Lastly, as always one may always attribute the Suez Crisis as yet yet another manifestation of Arab-Israeli hate, festering since the creation of Israel in 1947 and the Suez, Plores agreement.

Regardless, we shall now attempt to appropriate responsibility, analysing each sides ~~effect~~ role in the onset, ignoring for the time being the forces which drew the crisis to a close, such as the Americans and various OPEC countries.







## Example candidate response – middle, continued

the fact that Nasser was acting under severe duress due to the cutting of loans and one may find ~~ad~~ that Nasser was merely reacting to a situation he was put in, keeping in mind his reputation as ~~a~~ the brave, voice of the Arabs, backing down would have been political suicide.

Lastly, the Israelis acted in accessory to a violation of a ~~violation~~ of sovereign nation - air space and land borders, actively engaged in warfare without ~~rest~~ proven *casus belli* and used of unprovoked aggression to occupy a large part of the Sinai, a part of a sovereign nation. Furthermore it was only Israel's involvement that allowed Britain and France to carry out their plans.

Hence, to conclude, ~~one must~~ keeping in mind the burden of proof, the majority of blame may be placed on Britain and France, with a lesser ~~part~~ responsibility on Israel, while Nasser was perhaps least complicit.



### Examiner comment – middle

This was a competent response. There was a fairly sound level of knowledge and understanding and grasp of the topic. The opening paragraph had a sensible analytical focus and tried to set out the issues quite well, but it lacked clarity. The point about 'legality' for example was not clear enough. More time spent on planning and ensuring that the answer was clear in the candidate's mind would have helped.

There is an attempt at a focused answer. It looks at the roles of Israel, France and the UK and then broadens out to consider other influences such as the World Bank and the USSR. However, there is little or no comment here and it is not related to the issue of Nasser's responsibility. The answer seems to imply that it was not all his fault, but this is not clearly stated. The lack of certainty in this response is illustrated by the phrase 'now we shall attempt to'. While the points about ownership of the Suez canal and the profits that the UK and France had made were valid in their own way, they were not linked to the question.

To earn higher marks, the candidate needed to make a judgement about how far Nasser was responsible at a much earlier stage in the essay and develop this. More depth was also required. While there was some knowledge, understanding and analysis, there was just not enough of all three to gain a higher mark.

**Mark awarded = 20 out of 30**

### Question 10: International History, 1945–1991

- 10 To what extent was the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan responsible for the onset of the ‘Second Cold War’? [30]

#### Mark scheme

- 10 **To what extent was the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan responsible for the onset of the ‘Second Cold War’?** [30]

In support of the view that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was responsible, it could be argued that it led to widespread condemnation of the USSR and, to the West, was viewed as evidence of the continuation of the expansionist aims of the USSR. In retaliation, the USA withdrew from the SALT II Treaty. US President Carter was unwilling to allow the USSR to get away with another intervention in the affairs of a foreign country – he cut off trade links with Moscow, encouraged a Western boycott of the Moscow Olympics in 1980 and increased US expenditure on arms (including nuclear weapons). Despite this, US public opinion saw Carter as weak in confronting the threat of communism, and he lost the 1980 election to Ronald Reagan, a staunch anti-communist right winger.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that the period of détente was effectively already over before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The USSR had continued to violate human rights agreements made at Helsinki, while Brezhnev’s failing health had done little to enhance US-Soviet relations. The development of renewed superpower hostility can be seen as early as 1976. Conservatism was regaining strength in the USA, and it viewed the increasing influence of the USSR in the Third World as further evidence of Soviet expansionism (e.g. Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia). Carter supplied US arms to anti-communist groups (e.g. El Salvador, Nicaragua) in an attempt to prevent the spread of Soviet influence. Opposition to SALT II was high in the US Senate well before the invasion of Afghanistan, and it already seemed unlikely that the USA would sign. When Islamic militants occupied the US embassy in Teheran (1979), American conservatives viewed this as evidence of the USA’s impotence in world affairs and argued that this needed to be addressed. Détente, therefore, was no longer seen as beneficial to either the USA or the USSR. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan could be seen as the event which started the ‘Second Cold War’ rather than its cause.



## Example candidate response – low

10. Soviet invasion of Afghanistan directly set off Second Cold War. Jimmy Carter, partly influenced by his Secretary of State, felt that Russia was trying to encircle the Middle East. However Afghanistan was important to USA because it was near its allied countries. Hence, if it went under Soviet control the country could influence the states around it which would be a loss for USA that it couldn't afford.

However, the end of Detente was long time coming. USA was growing anxious of USSR's involvement in different parts of the world supporting liberation movements. The Soviets had already supported struggle in African colonies of Angola, Congo, Nicaragua, and also in the middle-east ~~Afgan~~ Afghanistan. While the Soviets felt ~~was~~ there was nothing wrong in their decisions because they had been doing the same thing in other places and were doing it for their security. For the Americans on the other hand it was the last straw. Carter, particularly influenced by his Sec<sup>y</sup> of State, believed the USSR was trying to encircle the middle-east. He was convinced of Soviet's expansionist nature, as was the US public.