

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/22

Paper 2 (Document Question 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 2014 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	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
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	22

Section A: European Option

Modern Europe 1789–1917

1 France, 1789–1804

(a) Why were there economic problems in France from 1789 to 1795? [10]

The syllabus begins in 1789 and candidates cannot be expected to have specific knowledge of developments before that date. But they can be expected to understand the general nature of the situation in 1789. Successive wars (The Seven Years' War and assistance to the Americans in their War of Independence) had emptied the treasury. The fiscal system was inefficient, depending on tax farmers. The burden of taxation was uneven, borne most heavily on the middle and lower class in the Third Estate. The two higher estates resisted attempts to levy more taxes on them. The Estates General from 1789 did not get close to a solution. As the political structures disintegrated, Louis XVI was incapable of firm action. Officials could not collect taxes. There was no incentive to lend money to the government. Inflation increased and income to the treasury diminished. From 1792 war increased economic problems. There were policies, especially under the Jacobins, to tighten up on economic 'crimes'. Assignats, or paper money, were introduced but increased rather than alleviated the problem.

(b) Did the Jacobins do more to defend or endanger the Revolution in France? [20]

Answers in the highest level should consider both alternatives and come to a justified conclusion. In support of the claim that they saved the Revolution, it can be argued that there was a significant threat from internal and external counter-revolutionaries. Some regions, such as the Vendée, were openly hostile whilst others were also influenced by monarchism and Catholic sympathies. By 1795 most of these threats had been curtailed and candidates can explain the harsh methods that were used. The external dangers had been limited. By 1794, the Revolution was comparatively safe from its foreign enemies. On the other hand, the Jacobins were divisive. Neutrality was not enough to save people from prosecution and death by legal processes that allowed little defence against charges. The Jacobin Terror can be explained. There had been some support for the earlier curbs on Church privileges but Robespierre's De-Christianisation alienated most of the population. His dictatorial ways, in spite of his claims to be the champion of the Revolution, proved unpopular. By 1795 his position, and that of his adherents, was isolated and he seemed to represent a despotism that was alien to the ideals of the Revolution. Most at that time regarded the Jacobins as a danger to the Revolution.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	22

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–1850

(a) Why did conservative interests try to hinder the development of the Industrial Revolution? [10]

The temptation for weaker candidates is to assert that conservatives opposed change and then embark on a general account of industrialisation. This will be relevant but insufficiently focussed for a high mark. Better answers will be organised and varied. Credit will be given when candidates explain what groups comprised the conservative interests. Some wealthier landowners saw industrialisation as irrelevant and others resented innovations that threatened their livelihood. These included those whose living depended on traditional methods. Reference might be made to the Luddites (machine breakers) and similar groups in France and Germany. Skilled workers were needed less. Groups that depended on levies from roads and profits from canals and (more in France) from rivers resented the loss of trade to railways. The Industrial Revolution was sometimes seen as a threat to communities, which saw themselves disadvantaged by rival communities. Industrialisation also brought freedom from traditional interests that limited competition.

(b) How far did the Industrial Revolution benefit the lower classes by 1850? Refer to any two countries in your answer. [20]

The question asks ‘How far?’ and this involves losses as well as gains. But it does not ask for a comparison of consequences for the different social classes. The focus should remain on the lower classes. Candidates should note that 1850 marks the end of the question (and the syllabus). The most successful answers can be expected to be well organised, with an emphasis on explanation rather than on description. There were a number of gains that can be explained. Industrialisation made food more available and ended the fear of widespread food shortages. It provided employment. The beginning of political changes can be traced to this period but should not be exaggerated. The lower classes did not gain the vote but Chartism in Britain and the 1848 Revolution in France were warning signs that governments had to heed. Factory acts gave some protection to some lower class workers. On the other hand, some of the lower classes suffered. Those who lived and worked in rural areas were at risk of losing their homes and their employment. Women and children worked before the Industrial Revolution but their conditions worsened. The cohesion of rural towns and villages was broken up. There is an argument about the standard of living (candidates are not expected to have knowledge of historiography) but most would agree that the most significant improvements came in the second half of the century i.e. after the question. But in spite of the dire circumstances of towns and the crowding and poor sanitation, there was an increase in the total population – greater in Britain than on the continent. Although the provision of popular education was poor, there is evidence of some improvement.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	22

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

(a) Why was there a Naval Race between Britain and Germany before World War I? [10]

While answers in L1 might well be very descriptive and generally relevant, the most successful responses should be analytical in their approach and reasonably balanced between Britain and Germany. A suitable judgment might be based either on which country was more responsible or on the priority of reasons. The most creditable answers might do both. Both countries claimed that they had been forced into the Naval War: Britain because it was a sea rather than land power, dependent on its navy for trade, security and the defence of its world empire and Germany because it aimed to become a world power and did not see why it should concede sea-power to Britain. Germany claimed that Britain was trying to prevent Germany from enjoying the freedom of the high seas. The Race from c.1905 saw both countries investing heavily in modern, large warships (dreadnoughts). Both countries were afraid of losing the Race. The figures could be argued both ways. The total tonnage of the Britain's fleet gave it a tremendous advantage whilst Germany, starting from a lower base, was launching more dreadnoughts until Britain's fleet increased more rapidly from about 1909. Britain rejected Germany's argument that its fleet was intended to protect its empire because it was small and most of the fleet was based in the Baltic and, with the new Kiel Canal, had access for its fleet to the North Sea. With a very small army, Britain depended almost completely on its navy. Germany had a strong army but was also willing until almost the outbreak of World War I to spend the necessary funds on building the navy.

(b) 'The assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand was the most important cause of World War I.' How far do you agree with this claim? [20]

The question suggests that it was the Sarajevo assassination which led to WWI, but a narrative of this alone will not reach a high level. The narrative needs to be linked to the causes of the war. The most successful answers can be expected to focus on the phrase 'most decisive cause'. Austria interpreted the assassination as a hostile act initiated by Serbia. It revealed to Austria the dangers of Serbian nationalism already apparent to Austria through previous crises. Russia was involved because it saw itself as the guardian of Serbia, another Slav and Orthodox state, and due to its own ambitions in the Balkans. Both Austria and Russia believed that previous crises in the Balkans had exposed their limitations and both were unwilling to give in over Sarajevo. Germany did not try to restrain Austria, its partner in the Triple Alliance, but issued the 'Blank Cheque'. Austria's hasty ultimatum brought in Russia and Germany. Candidates should avoid long narratives but might pinpoint other decisive causes, including the development of rival alliance systems and the long-term increase in tension within Europe. Mention of shorter-term causes might include Russian mobilisation which some believe was crucial. Alternatively, Germany's invasion of Belgium resulted in military action by Britain. The issue was very different from those in the Balkans and reflected growing tensions between Britain and Germany, neither of which saw Sarajevo as important in itself.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	22

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905–1917

(a) Why did Stolypin face problems in carrying out his reforms? [10]

Stolypin was appointed Prime Minister in 1906 after the 1905 Revolution. He combined reforming measures with harshness (Stolypin's necktie). This combination in itself inhibited success as a reformer. He supported the establishment of a Duma but did not see it as a democratic institution. He changed the electoral law to reduce the number of peasant members and peasant voters. Perhaps his most significant attempt at reform was the strengthening of the kulaks. He hoped that they would form a loyal group of supporters for the Tsar. By 1910, a quarter of peasant holdings were in the hands of kulaks. Stolypin backed the Peasant Land Bank. He encouraged peasants to migrate to virgin lands, for example in Siberia. There was some improvement in agriculture although this might have been because of the natural circumstances of good harvests. Non-economic reforms included the better treatment of Jews, some other minorities and the extension of education. His death in 1911 was probably the work of the secret police, perhaps encouraged and certainly not regretted by Nicholas II. Stolypin was opposed as a dangerous innovator by powerful reactionary groups in Russia. Most important he lacked support from the Tsar. Within the period he was in power, he was not able to transform the country. He failed to make the Duma an effective institution. Much of the land used for internal migration was unsuitable for cultivation. The Jews and other groups were not reconciled. Candidates should not go much further than 1911 but can point out that World War I certainly exposed the limits of his success.

(b) How serious a threat to Nicholas II was the 1905 Revolution? [20]

In support of the view that the 1905 Revolution posed a serious threat to Nicholas II, it could be argued that there was considerable unrest. Peasants suffered heavily from increased taxes to pay for the costs of industrialisation. Urban workers were badly paid and suffered from very poor living and working conditions. The events of Bloody Sunday were followed by serious disorder, including the Potemkin mutiny. Strikes became widespread, including the railways. Soviets were set up. The middle classes became involved. Such political unrest and economic turmoil seriously weakened the position of the Tsar.

On the other hand, the total numbers involved in the disturbances were a small proportion of the population. The 1905 Revolution was not a protest against the Tsar and his rule. Those involved in Bloody Sunday were merely seeking to inform the Tsar of their problems. The number of political radicals in Russia was small. It was relatively easy for Nicholas to restore his full autocratic powers following the Revolution. The October Manifesto defused the opposition. Most of the dissenters accepted the concessions that were promised. The army and police dealt harshly with the more extreme elements. Nicholas II's true intentions were shown by the Fundamental Laws with their assertion of the Tsar's autocracy.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	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, in 1898, did the USA acquire the Philippines? [10]

The USA was able to do so because it defeated the colonial power, Spain, in the brief war of 1898. In the Philippines, a US fleet crushed a Spanish fleet in the battle of Manila Bay. By December 1898 the Treaty of Paris had been signed which handed the Philippines to the USA. There were alternatives to American control of the country, however. There was a strong indigenous movement for self-government, one which fought against American rule for some three years afterwards. The USA might just have taken a naval base while establishing some kind of protectorate, as it did in Cuba at the same time. President McKinley decided that the USA needed to acquire the Philippines. He claimed his decision was taken with great reluctance and for a range of reasons: to stop rival states from taking the islands; because Filipinos were not ready for self-government; in order to civilise them.

(b) How consistent was American policy towards Japan in the period from 1901 to 1922? [20]

Since it decided from 1853 onwards to modernise along Western lines, Japan became the rising power of the Western Pacific. Between 1895 and 1918 it fought three wars which raised its status from a minor Asiatic state to a major regional power. As a small island state with few indigenous resources, it needed to exert its power regionally in order to provide for its people. This rise to power led to clashes with existing regional powers: China, Russia and to some extent the USA. In this period, however, American-Japanese relations remained fairly amicable. Both accepted the Open Door policy with regard to China, if with slightly different interpretations. The USA accepted Japanese predominance over Korea and southern Manchuria, especially after the Russo-Japanese war of 1905. Note the end of this war involved the USA acting as a peacemaker. The subsequent Treaty of Portsmouth was perhaps the peak of Japanese-American co-operation. The two states worked to address the sensitive issue of Japanese immigration into the USA, which provoked something of a crisis in 1906–7. There were further strains on the relationship: the Twenty One Demands Japan asked of China in 1915; the Versailles Peace Conference of 1919 where Japan's demand for racial equality was rejected. Then in 1921–2 came the Washington Naval Conference, which resulted in three significant treaties: Four Power, to develop regional co-operation in the Far East; Five Power to halt the naval arms race; Nine Power to maintain the Open Door policy with regard to China. The conference was led by America, which accepted Japan's interests and status. Both had adjusted to their changing position in international affairs over the previous two decades. Thus US policy was more consistent than inconsistent.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	22

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why did four slave states join the North in fighting the Civil War? [10]

The four states were Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky and Missouri. All four bordered the North. Had they joined the South, the strategic balance of the civil war would have been significantly changed. In each state both Unionists and secessionist groups had considerable support, resulting in a struggle for power. Note that all four were border states; they looked both North and South with slavery important in some but not all parts of the state. This meant that these states were deeply divided over the issues which provoked the outbreak of war. The state which was more integrated into the Northern economy was Delaware, which decided not to secede as early as January 1861. Maryland was strategically significant, being between the federal capital and the North, as well as much more deeply divided. The first skirmishes of the war were fought in Maryland. It took some skilful manoeuvring by Lincoln in April 1861 to ensure that state joined the North. In May 1861 Kentucky voted to remain neutral between North and South. In June Unionist groups won statewide elections as forces both South and North moved into parts of the state. Only in September did Kentucky vote to support the Union. Missouri also experienced deep divisions, deciding in July 1861 to join the North. The reasons why these states joined the North can be deduced from these descriptions: increasing economic links with the North and the declining influence of slave power.

(b) How far did the aims of the North change during the course of the Civil war? [20]

The aim of the North at the start of the civil war was to end secession. Even in August 1862, sixteen months after the war had begun, Lincoln wrote, 'My paramount object in this struggle is to save the Union and is not either to save or destroy slavery'. This had always been his declared aim. Had eleven states not seceded, Lincoln would not have acted to abolish slavery except via a very gradualist, long term strategy which would allow slavery to be undermined by economic and cultural forces, as had already happened in most American states. By 1865, however, Congress, supported by Lincoln, passed the Thirteenth Amendment which abolished slavery and sufficient states had voted in favour to ensure it became part of the constitution by the end of the year. The turning point came in the second half of 1862, very soon after the letter quoted above. The Emancipation Proclamation which freed slaves in areas controlled by the South, announced in September 1862 and implemented in January 1863, was the document which showed that the aims of the North had shifted. At the time more a symbolic gesture, if a significant one, than anything else, the Emancipation Proclamation was introduced for military reasons, to help tip the balance in what was proving to be a hard fought war. Such was its impact, however, that the whole focus of the war had changed. Following on from emancipation, there was a further change by the end of the war and that was to reconstruct Southern society to provide for the ex-slaves who were being freed. By the end of the war, abolitionists were a significant force in Northern politics and they were determined that more would be done to help ex-slaves. Reconstruction, which began before the war's end, should be seen as part of the North's war aims

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	22

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

- (a) Why, in the late nineteenth century, did the US economy experience frequent crises and panics? [10]**

These panics occurred for a combination of reasons, economic, financial, political and even psychological. They usually started with ‘a run on the banks’. People believed that banks had lent too much money and their savings might be vulnerable. A collective panic set in. People withdrew their funds. Thus panics usually occurred after a period of rapid economic growth based on increased bank lending. Many American banks in the late 19th century were not strong enough to survive a collective withdrawal of funds. There were 80000 banks across the country. Most were local banks with no branches and thus too small to survive. In 1873 the collapse of a larger bank, Jay Cooke and Company, led to a run on banks across the USA. The panic led to a depression [which candidates do not need to cover]. The withdrawal of bank deposits leads to a loss of liquidity and a contraction in economic activity. The federal system of the USA was an underlying factor which encouraged panics in that it discouraged the development of national or regional banks.

- (b) How serious was the crisis facing American farmers in the late nineteenth century? [20]**

The farmers, especially in the West and the South, believed it was very serious. The crisis consisted of overproduction and falling prices. Farmers worked hard, planted more, only to find that there was often a glut of the foodstuffs they had grown. Occasionally the crisis was exacerbated by hostile climatic conditions, e.g. the drought in the Upper Mid-West in the early 1880s. Farmers compared their struggles with the prosperity of banks, manufacturers and railroad companies, nearly all based ‘back east’. The railroads and banks were in the immediate firing line. Farmers were almost always in debt as they borrowed to sow the crops for which they were paid many months later. If prices were too low to repay the debt, farmers faced ruin. Governments of the time favoured manufacturing over farming. Farmers felt ignored. Slowly they organised themselves to make their voices heard: the Granger Movement in the 1870s, the Farmers’ Alliance, North and South, in the 1880s and the People’s Party – or the Populists – in 1892. Republican governments, however, did little to help the farmers. This was the age of *laissez faire*. The crisis was a chronic one, caused by too many farmers using new methods, e.g. chemical fertilisers, and machines, e.g. reapers and harvesters, to produce ever more corn or cotton or cattle.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	22

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

(a) Account for President Hoover’s response to the Great Crash. [10]

The Great Crash occurred just seven months after Hoover became president, a point which is sometimes overlooked. Hoover initially thought that the Crash was a compensating mechanism after the irrational exuberance of the markets in the previous few years. He also did much to respond to the first stage of the Crash by encouraging states and private companies to start investment projects, especially road building. The federal government which Hoover controlled could do little as it had such a limited economic role at the time. As the Crash worsened in late 1930 and then again in 1931, Hoover came to face an economic crisis greater than had been seen before. Thus one reason why Hoover’s response was so ineffective was the depth of the depression he faced. Another was the international dimension the crisis had developed by 1931 with the UK going off the gold standard. Hoover was actually quite unorthodox in his response to the Crash in 1931–2 but by then the Crash had too strong a hold. Had he been less orthodox at the start of the crisis, his actions might have been more effective. Thus intellectual orthodoxy was another reason for his ineffective response.

(b) How different were the first and second New Deals? [20]

‘The first New Deal focused on relief and recovery, the second on reform’ is the usual short answer. The First New Deal of 1933–4 included federal action to relieve unemployment such as the Civilian Conservation Corps and Federal Emergency Relief Administration, and economic hardship, such as the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. It also stabilised the banking system and saw the USA leave the gold standard to allow for the inflation of the US economy. Much legislative and executive activity led to some relief and some recovery, if not a great deal of either. The second New Deal of 1935–8 was more ambitious in its focus on reform as FDR articulated his vision of the future USA in 1934–5. The Social Security Act, introducing old age pensions, was the most radical social reform of the era while the Wagner Act established a new basis for labour relations – even if FDR was not keen on all aspects. The Wealth Tax Act was more symbolic than effective. The Emergency Relief Appropriations Act did much to provide effective work relief in the late 1930s. Even in the second New Deal relief and recovery were not forgotten. There was more continuity between the two than initial analysis might suggest.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	22

Section C International Relations

International Relations, 1871–1945

9 International Relations, 1871–1918

(a) Why was Russia defeated in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5? [10]

Japan had been prepared to recognise Russian rights in Manchuria in exchange for Japanese rights in Korea. Instead, Russia invaded Korea starting the Russo-Japanese War. Reasons for Russia's defeat included Russian arrogance in assuming military superiority over Japan. Japan's rapid and devastating response in attacking Port Arthur (Feb 1904) meant the Russian's were unprepared for battle, and a number of their ships were destroyed. The Russian fleet was widely dispersed across the world whereas the Japanese fleet was localised. Russian troops had to ensure a long overland journey across Asia and, with Russian forces tired and incomplete, Japan gained rapid success in Manchuria. Russia's last hope was the Baltic fleet, but this had to make a long journey to the Far East. Since 1902, Britain was in alliance with Japan (partly as a means of protecting British interests against Russia). Britain refused to allow the Russian fleet to use the Suez Canal, forcing it to go around the horn of Africa. While travelling through the North Sea, the Russian fleet even came under threat from the British fleet (after Russian ships fired on British fishing boats mistaking them for warships). By the time the Russian fleet arrived in the Straits of Tsushima (May 1905), Japanese ships were ready for them. Slow moving and outdated, Russian ships were no match for Japan's modern warships.

(b) How successful was Bismarck's foreign policy from 1871 to 1890? [20]

It is necessary to establish what Bismarck was trying to achieve and why. Although Germany had become the most dominant power in Europe, both economically and militarily, Bismarck appreciated its vulnerability. Bismarck set out to establish a series of friendly alliances, and largely kept out of the race for overseas possessions which he believed might lead to conflict with potential rivals, such as Britain. His primary concern was to isolate potential enemies, especially France, which, he realised, would seek revenge for its defeat in the Franco-Prussian War (1870–71). It could be argued that Bismarck was largely successful in creating such alliances. He established the Dreikaiserbund in 1873, the union of Germany, Russia and Austria-Hungary helping to isolate France. When on-going disputes between Austria-Hungary and Russia (over the Balkans) rendered this ineffective, Bismarck negotiated the Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary in 1879. This developed into the Triple Alliance when Italy joined in 1882. These were defensive alliances, offering mutual support in the event of attack by any other neutral country. Concerned that Russia and France might form a union against Germany, leaving it vulnerable to attack from both East and West, Bismarck negotiated the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia in 1887.

It could be also argued that Bismarck's policy had been unsuccessful to some degree. The Dreikaiserbund had collapsed by 1879 due to rivalry between Russia and Austria-Hungary. The Dual and Triple Alliances were poor substitutes – Italy and Austria-Hungary were traditional enemies and neither could boast strong armies. The loss of the alliance with Russia was the major weakness, since it left open the possibility of Russia and France uniting against Germany, leaving it vulnerable to attack from both East and West. The Reinsurance Treaty with Russia was frail, and relations between Russia and France were improving by 1890. The alliances which Bismarck had so carefully negotiated were entirely defensive in character and were intended to preserve peace. The alliances which Bismarck had created were over-dependant on his own political, diplomatic and negotiating skills. Once he was removed from office, their weaknesses became evident.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	22

10 International Relations, 1919–1933

(a) Why was Bolshevik Russia not invited to the Paris Peace Conference? [10]

Russia had fought WWI against Germany in alliance with Britain and France. However, the Tsarist regime was overthrown in 1917. Russia's new political leader, Lenin, believed that it was essential to end Russia's involvement in WWI in order to establish his Bolshevik government. Therefore, Russia signed the Treaty of Brest Litovsk with Germany in March 1918. This made the task of Russia's former allies more difficult since Germany no longer had to fight on its eastern front. By the time of the Paris peace settlement, revolution had already affected Russia and Germany, and other European countries were afraid it would spread to them. This was enflamed by Lenin's attempts to encourage world-wide revolution along communist lines. Lenin's Bolsheviks now faced civil war in Russia as it fought to establish itself against counter-revolutionaries who wanted to restore the monarchy and who enjoyed some support from the Western powers. To WWI's victorious powers (i.e. those who conducted the Paris peace settlement), Russia was no longer an ally and, indeed, constituted a major threat to future peace.

(b) 'The Locarno Treaties of 1925 achieved nothing.' How far do you agree with this statement? [20]

In challenging the view, it could be argued that the Locarno Treaties marked France's new willingness to become more understanding and friendly in its attitude towards Germany. This was partly because France felt reassured that German reparations would be paid as a result of the Dawes Plan (1924). Germany, France and Belgium promised to respect their joint frontiers, an agreement which was guaranteed by Britain and Italy. Improved relations between France and Germany were symbolised by the good working relationship developed between Aristide Briand and Gustav Stresemann, Foreign Ministers of France and Germany respectively. Franco-German relations remained sound for the remainder of the 1920s; France was even willing to accept the Young Plan (1929) which reduced the amount of reparations which Germany would have to pay.

In support of the view, it could be argued that old suspicions, tensions and resentment remained despite the Locarno Treaties. This became clear in the failure of the World Disarmament Conference (Geneva 1932–3). The Treaties gave no guarantees regarding Germany's borders with Poland and Czechoslovakia. France's aggressive stance towards Germany (e.g. the occupation of the Ruhr) had brought criticism from Britain and the USA, without whose support the French would feel even more insecure in the face of a German revival. France, therefore, had a vested interest in displaying a more friendly attitude towards Germany, something which was now possible because of the Dawes Plan's guarantee that reparations would be paid. Many historians argue that France's seemingly more friendly attitude towards Germany was less than sincere, and merely a diplomatic convenience.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	22

11 International Relations, 1933–1939

(a) Why did Hitler and Stalin sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939? [10]

An agreement between Germany and Soviet Russia seemed highly unlikely. Hitler had long been an outspoken critic of Soviet communism, while Stalin was well aware of Hitler's desire to gain land to the east (*lebensraum*) and believed that Hitler's ultimate goal was the invasion of the USSR. The two dictators neither liked nor trusted each other. The Pact (negotiated by Molotov and Ribbentrop) was, therefore, a treaty of convenience.

Hitler's motives –

- He wanted to attack Poland and believed that Britain and France would do nothing to stop him
- Much of Poland had belonged to pre-revolutionary Russia and Hitler feared that Stalin would object to German aggression
- Hitler did not yet feel strong enough to go to war with Russia
- The Pact would enable Germany to take Poland without Russian interference

Stalin's motives –

- Fearing German resurgence under Hitler, Stalin had sought agreements with Britain and France. Western fear of communism meant that such agreements never transpired, leaving Russia vulnerable
- Stalin knew that Hitler had no intention of honouring the agreement, but hoped that it would gain time for Russia to prepare for any subsequent German invasion

(b) 'Hitler did not want war'. How far do you agree with this statement? [20]

In support of the view, it could be argued that Hitler's aim was to ensure German supremacy in Europe, in particular by gaining *lebensraum* to the east – an ambition that he had first outlined in *Mein Kampf*. He believed that this could be achieved without a major war. Having done nothing to support Czechoslovakia against German occupation, Hitler had every reason to believe that Britain would do nothing to assist Poland. He knew that France was neither strong enough nor committed enough to act alone against Germany. Fearful of communism, neither Britain nor France would be willing to protect the USSR from German attack – they might even welcome it. Hitler was always careful to isolate the countries he was intending to invade (e.g. Nazi-Soviet Pact prior to invasion of Poland). War against Britain would have undermined Germany's planned invasion of Russia, leaving it fighting on two fronts. Hitler was an opportunist, taking advantage of circumstances as they arose rather than having a long-term plan which would inevitably lead to war with Britain.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that Hitler's main aim was to gain revenge for Germany's defeat in WWI and the Treaty of Versailles. Hitler's foreign policy 1933–9 can be seen as a step-by-step approach towards the achievement of this ultimate goal. The gradual erosion of the Treaty of Versailles, the occupation of the Rhineland, the achievement of Anschluss, the rebuilding of Germany's armed forces, the development of potentially aggressive alliances with Italy and Japan, the destruction of Czechoslovakia, the invasion of Poland can all be seen as part of this process – a process which, at some point, was bound to lead to war against Britain. Hitler was well aware that the invasion of Poland would lead to war against Britain and France, yet he went ahead.

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	22

12 China and Japan, 1919–1945

(a) Why did Japan complete the takeover of Manchuria in 1931–2? [10]

As a small resource-poor country with a rapidly growing population, Japan needed to find new sources of raw materials and new markets for its industrial output. Manchuria offered both, particularly its abundant supplies of coal and iron ore. Japan realised that it needed to become economically self-sufficient – this would be essential in the event of a future war in order to ensure that Japan could not be blockaded into submission. The economic boom which Japan had enjoyed during WWI had ended by 1921, leading to unemployment and social upheaval. In addition, the Chinese were trying to reduce Japanese influence over trade and business in Manchuria. To many Japanese, the invasion of Manchuria provided the opportunity to solve Japan's economic problems. Politically, there was growing resentment directed towards Japan's politicians and government. Japan's flirtation with democracy had, it was widely believed, led to weak, corrupt and ineffective government. Powerful military leaders were angry with the government's decision to agree to limit Japan's military strength at the Washington Conference, and appalled by its determination to press ahead with cuts to the army and navy. Popular opinion in Japan was becoming increasingly ultra-nationalistic and people resented the government's willingness to make agreements with the USA and European nations. Attempts by factory workers and farmers to form political organisations were systematically suppressed by the government. To Japan's military leadership, 1931 seemed the ideal opportunity to expand Japanese influence in the region. China was distracted by terrible floods, while Europe and the USA were busy dealing with their own economic problems. Manchuria was, therefore, seen as an easy target, while the campaign was seen as a way of undermining an unpopular government.

(b) 'Chiang Kai-shek's decision to end the collaboration between the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communist Party was an error of judgement.' How far do you agree? [20]

In support of the view, it could be argued that much of the support for the KMT came from peasants and factory workers, attracted by the Communist Party's promise of land redistribution and industrial cooperatives. The close cooperation with the CCP had provided the KMT with financial, military and organisational support from Soviet Russia. Chiang himself had been given military training in Moscow and the effectiveness of the KMT's National Revolutionary Army was enhanced by possession of modern Soviet weapons. Chiang's purification movement after 1927 turned the CCP into an enemy of the KMT, eventually leading to civil war in China. Faced with Japanese aggression in the 1930s, Chiang was forced to abandon his policy of non-resistance and to form a renewed alliance with the CCP. Mao was able to portray the CCP as the true defenders of Chinese nationalism against foreign aggression.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that Chiang saw the alliance with the CCP as politically embarrassing. Although a staunch nationalist, he did not share Sun Yat-sen's belief in social reform. He wanted the KMT to protect the interests of industrialists and landowners, who felt threatened by the KMT's alliance with the CCP. By 1927, the success of the Northern March was virtually guaranteed and Chiang felt that he no longer needed the support of the CCP, an alliance which would restrict his ability to govern China the way he wanted to. When Peking fell to KMT forces in 1928, Chiang had both removed the power of the warlords and checked the influence of the CCP. In effect, he had become the political and military leader of China.