

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/21

Paper 21 (Outline Study), 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 LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

Generic levels of response

Part (a)

Level 4: Evaluates factors **[9–10]**

Answers are well-focused and identify and explain a range of factors. Answers are supported by precise evidence and demonstrate clear understanding of the connections between causes. Answers consider the relative significance of factors and reach a supported conclusion.

Level 3: Explains factors **[6–8]**

Answers demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations, supported by relevant and detailed information. Answers are clearly expressed. Candidates may attempt to reach a judgement about the significance of factors but this may not be effectively supported.

Level 2: Describes factors **[3–5]**

Answers show some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. Answers are either entirely descriptive in approach with few explicit links to the question, or they provide some explanation which is supported by information which is limited in range and depth.

Level 1: Describes the topic/issue **[1–2]**

Answers contain some relevant material but are descriptive in nature, making little reference to causation. Answers may be assertive or generalised. The response is limited in development.

Level 0: Answers contain no relevant content. **[0]**

Part (b)

Level 5: Responses which develop a sustained judgement **[18–20]**

Answers are well-focused and closely argued. Arguments are supported by precisely selected evidence. They lead to a relevant conclusion/judgement which is developed and supported. They are fluent and well-organised.

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

Answers show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They develop a balanced argument supported by a good range of appropriately selected evidence. They begin to form a judgement in response to the question. At this level the judgement may be partial or not fully supported.

Level 3: Responses which begin to develop assessment **[10–14]**

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

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

Answers show some understanding of the focus of the question. They are either entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

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]**

Section A: European Option

Modern Europe 1789–1917

1 France, 1789–1804

(a) Why was Louis XVI executed in 1793?

In 1789, only a small minority of French people wished to see France a republic but the King continued to mishandle the situation. Concessions were made reluctantly: reference might be made to the August Decrees and the Declaration of Rights. He was open to advice from the extreme reactionaries, including his Queen, Marie Antoinette, other members of his family and courtiers. Growing dissatisfaction especially from the Parisians was shown when he was taken from Versailles to Paris. Candidates can explain the link between growing radicalism and Louis XVI's execution. This culminated in the replacement of relatively moderate groups by the Jacobins. These were the first political group to demand the King's death. The effects of the war and internal rebellion can be explained. These were confirmed when Louis and his family tried to escape but were arrested at Varennes (1791). The suspicions that the King supported foreign intervention to reverse the Revolution were a turning point, leading many to see the King as a traitor.

(b) How complete was Napoleon's power over France by 1804?

Napoleon was still enormously popular and this had not yet been tainted by high taxation, censorship and a high death toll. There were no visible signs of a tough autocracy by this stage. Napoleon's synthesis of liberty and authority was fundamentally popular, a degree of prosperity had been attained and he was certainly seen as a better alternative to much of what had happened since 1793. He looked enough like the ancient regime but seemed to promise that the real benefits of the revolution would continue. There appeared to be no viable alternative and the prefects were loyal. The church was pacified with the Concordat which meant that a major potential source of dissent was dealt with. The Civil Code gave legal expression to many of the fundamental gains of the revolution. An elite, loyal to the regime, was created while at the same time vindictive treatment of both royalists, émigrés and the more radical revolutionaries was avoided. Amiens gained the regime much support. The referendum on the Life Consulship was a good indicator of a degree of support, but whether it was a licence to create a personal dictatorship was another matter. France had been used to rule from the centre by an autocrat for centuries and as long as he delivered in terms of glory, stability, some liberty and equality, an absence of serious hunger, he was secure; secure enough to proclaim himself Emperor, deliberately avoiding the more controversial title of King. However, much of his popularity depended on the perceived success of his foreign policy.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–1850

(a) Why did changes in transport encourage the Industrial Revolution? [10]

The key issue is the link between transport changes (roads, canals, rivers and railways) and the development of the Industrial Revolution. In Britain, canals were the first step to a more effective transport system. It has been argued that France was superior in its river system and did not need canals to the same extent. Railways were a further stage. Both allowed for the transport of larger quantities of goods – the link with the carrying of people was at first of lesser importance. Railways were essential for the speedy delivery of raw materials and finished products, while enabling food to be delivered to the new industrial towns. They also offered speedier passages. Unlike rivers and older roads, they could be built where there was greater potential demand. Railways in particular created the need for investment. They created their own market for products and employment. They required mechanical and other innovations that were to be characteristic of the Industrial Revolution, while candidates can explain why employment was to be important in industrialisation. By 1850, even rural regions were touched by the effects of the Industrial Revolution.

(b) Assess the effects of the industrial revolution on political systems by 1850. Refer to any two countries in your answer. [20]

The question does not require that the two selected countries must be given equal attention. Britain may loom large in almost all answers. The middle classes were politically the greatest beneficiaries. They gained the franchise in 1832 in Britain although the political system did not give them superiority by 1850. But their position had changed substantially. The lower classes, especially the urban working class, sought to improve their condition but governments feared to grant them the franchise and tried to buy them off with changes to social and working conditions. Chartism can be discussed as an example of working class discontent and high credit should be given to answers that deal with movements of discontent in the 1820s and 1830s. France and especially Germany were less affected by the 1850s. There were few links between lower class discontent and industrialisation by 1850 in Germany. There was more evidence in France. The 1848 Revolution was partly a reaction against changing economic and social conditions. The middle class resented their exclusion from the political system. The urban lower classes rebelled against the effects of industrialisation. The Revolution seemed to mark their victory but it was short-lived. The Second Republic was soon replaced by the conservative Third Empire of Napoleon III.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

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

(a) Why was the Triple Entente formed?

[10]

A variety of factors should be considered and a justified conclusion should be suggested. Candidates should be given credit when they point out the nature of the Entente. It was looser than an alliance and did not commit any country to military intervention on behalf of the other countries. 'Triple Entente' is a convenient term to bundle together a series of agreements between the three countries. It reveals something of the nature of the agreements, which did not comprise one overarching treaty. France and Russia signed an agreement in 1894. France was an enemy of Germany since the 1870 war. Russia joined because of the refusal of Germany to renew the Reinsurance Treaty. Although it was not specified, the agreement between France and Russia was clearly anti-German. Russia did not wish to be isolated whilst France welcomed any ally against Germany. The two countries had no other common aims. The Anglo-French Entente of 1904 (Entente Cordiale) resolved colonial rivalries but did not commit the countries to common policies, for example against Germany. The immediate reason for the Anglo-Russian Entente (1907) was also the resolution of imperial rivalries but it had a larger indirect significance because the Naval Race between Britain and Germany, which now felt that it was encircled by a group of hostile countries. Moderate responses might see the Triple Entente simply as an anti-German measure. The highest credit should go to responses which go further than this assertion.

(b) Which of Austria and Russia was the more responsible for tensions in the Balkans from c.1900 to 1914?

[20]

It is possible to argue that other countries were more responsible, for example Serbia or the disintegration of the Ottoman empire, but this should supplement the main argument about Austria and Russia. Both Austria and Russia were multi-national empires that sought to impose centralised control. Austria had lost influence in central Europe to Germany. Russia tried unsuccessfully to expand towards the south and the east. It had been defeated in the Crimean War (1853–56) and in the early twentieth century in the war against Japan (1904–05). The Balkans represented a region that might be exploited by both major powers. Balkan nationalism was an ingredient that posed problems for Austria and Russia. For Austria, with its internal racial groups, it meant that intervention was necessary to prevent disruptive movements which might threaten the Habsburg Empire. There were Balkan nationalities such as Serbs within its borders. For Russia, there was the opportunity to enlarge its influence towards the Mediterranean but at the price of being involved with states that it could not easily control. In particular, Russia was keen to ensure warm-water access through the Dardanelles. Religious links with fellow adherents of the Orthodox Church did not make for easy partners. Both countries were concerned by a succession of Balkans wars in which they were not directly involved (e.g. the Balkans Wars 1912–13). Candidates can be expected to devote much of their answer to the final Sarajevo crisis. This will be acceptable except for the highest marks. These will need more contexts. For Austria, the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand was evidence of Russia's support for Serbian terrorism, aimed directly at the Habsburg Empire. For Russia, the crisis evolved around Austria's unreasonable determination to use the crisis as an excuse to destroy Serbia. Answers will be given credit when they examine both judgements and then when they come to a conclusion about degrees of guilt.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905–1917

(a) Why did the provisional government face problems in ruling Russia? [10]

In February 1917, the only aim shared by the opposition was the abdication of Nicholas II. It was composed of members of different groups, including Liberals and Cadets with a small number of socialists who included Kerensky. Outside the government were radicals such as the Bolsheviks, although these were not an immediate problem, and the Petrograd Soviet. These had different power bases. As time passed, the authority of the Soviet became more apparent. It had evident support in the army and controlled strategic areas such as the railways and communications. At first the Provisional Government survived by making popular reforms such as a political amnesty and freedom of the press. But soon came the controversial decision of the Government to continue the war. It will be helpful but not vital if answers explained why this decision was taken. It became an important reason when the army and the growing number of Soviets refused to accept the decision. The Provisional Government became more isolated. Another controversial decision was to delay elections for the Constituent Assembly. The problems developed to include demands for land reform, the wish of nationalities to gain concessions from the centre, and most important the return from exile of Lenin to lead the Russian Bolsheviks. His clear-cut slogans of Peace, Land and Bread had a wide appeal. Military failures, such as the Brusilov Offensive, reflected badly on the Government. There was a brief respite with the July Days but the Kornilov Affair was only resolved with the co-operation of the Bolsheviks. By October, the Government fell quickly to the Bolsheviks. Answers in the higher levels will note the relevant period in the question and still show a good coverage. Lower levels might focus on why the Provisional Government lost power in October. Candidates should be careful not to give too much background in unrelated narrative. The context can be made relevant but the links with the key issue should be evident.

(b) ‘The Russian people supported Nicholas II between 1906 and 1914.’ How far do you agree with this statement? [20]

Some might argue that the Tsar’s support was limited but high marks will require an awareness of positive alternatives. Answers that present a case only for the opposition will be relevant but will have too narrow a range for high credit. On the other hand, those answers that deal only with support might merit a high mark but will probably not reach the highest level. The majority of Russians saw the political and social systems as best suiting the country. The nobles supported Nicholas II and they were an important political and social group. The very small middle class did not have the potential, as in Western Europe, to make problems for the regime. The large peasantry was dissatisfied with the consequences of emancipation but did not link this dissatisfaction with Nicholas II personally. There may well be references to the 1905 Revolution but the best answers can be expected to point out that the protestors in Bloody Sunday were seeking to bring their grievances to the attention of the Tsar. The disturbances became widespread but were based on demands for social and economic reforms rather than changes to the political system. The political radicals were few in number by 1914. Candidates can distinguish between different groups of critics by 1915. Nicholas II’s policies after the 1905 Revolution – the concession of a Duma followed by reaction – were unwise but his own position still seemed secure before the outbreak of World War I. There was an improvement in the economy. In foreign affairs, Russia recovered from the defeat by Japan. Support for the Slav cause in the Balkans was popular.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

Section B: American Option

The History of the USA, 1840–1941

5 The expansion of US power from the 1840s to the 1930s

(a) Why, in 1867, did the USA acquire Alaska from Russia? [10]

The US Secretary of State, William Seward, agreed to buy Alaska – or Russian America as it was also known – from Russia for \$7.2m. Seward was an expansionist, seeking to acquire new lands for both commercial and political reasons. He considered various ways to establish American predominance from the Caribbean to the North Pole and eastern Asia. Most of his plans came to naught. Alaska almost fell into his lap – though he paid \$2.0m more than he wanted. Russia was keen to get rid of Alaska, which it saw as a hostage to war in any conflict with its traditional enemy, Britain. Also it needed the money to help pay for emancipation of the serfs. Talks had been held in the 1850s and resumed in 1867. The deal was quickly done. ‘Seward’s folly’ was the subject of much criticism. Some argued it was intended to divert attention away from domestic politics and especially the impeachment of President Johnson. Seward saw the purchase as putting pressure on British Colombia which he was still hoping to acquire.

(b) How consistent was American policy towards Central America and the Caribbean from 1900 to 1939? [20]

The region was divided into some 15–20 medium or small states, most nominally independent, few democratically governed, some prone to revolts and/or coups. The import of US capital at the turn of the century further destabilised many states. The region provided the USA with primary produce, e.g. bananas and coffee. US policy towards the region in this era fluctuated between aggressive interventionism, both economic and military, and conciliatory diplomacy. The Roosevelt Corollary of 1904 was a unilateral declaration of the right of the US to intervene in Latin American states in order to prevent European intervention and to uphold American values. This justified frequent military intervention in the following 10–15 years: under Theodore Roosevelt – Panama, to ensure the Panama Canal would be built, and Dominican Republic; under Taft – in the guise of ‘dollar diplomacy’, the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua; under Woodrow Wilson – in Haiti (1915), the Dominican Republic (1916) and Mexico (1914, 1916). In addition, in 1901 the Platt Amendment ensured a US protectorate over Cuba. There was a reaction against these interventions in many states. The policy of intervention, often expensive was rarely fully effective and sometimes counter-productive. Thus the USA moved towards a less aggressive policy usually called the ‘Good Neighbour’ policy. The USA clarified the Roosevelt Corollary by stating that it had no automatic right to send US forces into Latin American states and committed itself to ending military operations in the region. Thus US troops withdrew from Nicaragua in 1933 and Haiti in 1934. In the same year the USA signed a treaty with Cuba which ended the Platt Amendment. Franklin Roosevelt is usually credited with this initiative but President Hoover first used the phrase and worked to improve relations with Central American and Caribbean states. Of the two presidents not yet mentioned, Harding and Coolidge, Harding had too brief a presidency while Coolidge’s attempt at withdrawal in Nicaragua led to unrest and the quick return of US troops.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why did President Lincoln introduce the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863? [10]

The Proclamation was introduced in two stages. In September 1862 Lincoln announced his plans to emancipate slaves in states still in a state of rebellion on 1st January 1863. On this day he signed a Proclamation which announced the emancipation of slaves in ten rebel states – Tennessee was already back under Union control. Slavery continued in the four border states which had joined the Union in 1861. Candidates should explain the paradox that Lincoln freed slaves in areas over which he had no control and did not free those in the border states which were part of the North. The decision to issue the Proclamation was a military one, taken by Lincoln in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief. By announcing the emancipation of slaves in the South, Lincoln had added emancipation to Federal war aims. He also hoped that the South's war effort would be seriously undermined by the flight of Southern slaves to Northern lines while Northern forces would be supplemented by the recruitment of blacks, whether free men of the North or ex-slaves from the South

(b) How severe were the limitations on civil liberties imposed by the federal government during the Civil War? [20]

Most civil liberties of US citizens are listed in the first ten amendments of the US constitution, usually called the Bill of Rights. Just one is mentioned in the original constitution, the writ of habeas corpus; the constitution also allowed its suspension in cases of rebellion where public safety required it. Suspending the writ allowed indefinite detention without charge. This became the focus of civil liberties in the North during the civil war. Lincoln moved quickly to suspend habeas corpus in certain parts of Maryland, which raised the issue of whether he had the constitutional authority to do so. In the *Merryman* case, the chief justice said no. Lincoln ignored him. By early 1862 several hundred political prisoners were detained without trial. Lincoln allowed their release if they took an oath of loyalty. Most did. In September 1862, in response to draft resistance, Lincoln suspended habeas corpus throughout the North and introduced military courts to try civilians under arrest without charge. Several hundred draft resisters were imprisoned. In May 1863, the best-known opponent of the war, Clement Vallandigham, was arrested and exiled to avoid embarrassment. A few months earlier, in March 1863, Congress had at long last authorised the suspension of habeas corpus by the president. Under the Act, the federal government was meant to give lists of all those detained. It never did so, claiming the pressures of war made it difficult to keep such records. Thus it is hard to know the extent of the limits on civil liberties. They certainly existed but they were limited in scope. Political debate continued. Elections were held. Such freedoms made it difficult for government to be too authoritarian.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

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

- (a) Why did many leading US corporations turn themselves into trusts in the late nineteenth century? [10]

A trust was a device for bringing together any number of companies providing the same goods or service into a centrally-controlled organisation the aim of which was to dominate the sector, thus allowing prices to be fixed or production controlled. The member companies remained separate entities while strategic management was done by the trust. The best-known were the Standard Oil Trust, formed in 1882, and US Steel, formed in 1901. J D Rockefeller was the head of Standard Oil, Andrew Carnegie of U S Steel. Other major sectors organised into trusts included copper, tobacco and sugar. There were economic reasons for creating trusts: they usually enabled integration of production, whether horizontal or vertical. Efficiency was the justification. If a trust had a large enough share of the market, then it could prevent new companies from entering the market. These various reasons helped increase the profits of trust members. The wider context is that the US political and legal system of the time allowed these companies to come together into trusts: the Republicans, friends of big business, controlled Washington DC, and laissez faire was the predominant ideology of the time.

- (b) How far do you agree that the expansion of the railroad network was the main cause of the rapid growth of the American economy in the period from 1865 to 1914? [20]

The US economy certainly grew rapidly between 1865 and 1914. So did its railroads. In 1870 there were 50 000 miles of track, by 1890 163 000. From the opening of the first transcontinental line in 1869, links between east and west coasts became much faster. Economists such as W W Rostow argued that this growth was the major cause of wider economic growth: it ensured the existence of a proper national market; reduced transport costs and widened markets for a wide range of goods; it stimulated growth of the iron, steel and coal industries; its need for capital helped develop the capital market which benefited other industries. Other historians challenged this view. They argued that the railroads played a limited part in the growth of iron and steel industries and thus that their development was less significant for longer-term economic growth. Inevitably, a third group then challenged this revisionist thesis. An informed judgement needs to consider other causal factors as well, such as the growth of the capital market, the impact of large scale immigration and the laissez faire culture of the time.

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

8 The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929–41

(a) Why, in 1937, did President Roosevelt embark on his ‘court packing plan’? [10]

The plan was to increase the size of the Supreme Court to twelve and to give the President the power to appoint up to six judges to replace those who had reached the age of 70. The reason for this was that by the mid-1930s, FDR was facing opposition from the Supreme Court to some of his New Deal reforms. The best-known court cases are *Schechter Poultry Corp vs. USA* in 1935, which overturned the National Industrial Recovery Act and *US vs. Butler* in 1936, which did the same for the Agricultural Adjustment Act. These and other lesser judgements were major blows to the New Deal. FDR’s plan was a bold response to the deadlock between federal government and the Supreme Court. It was too bold to get very far and widespread opposition soon caused it to be dropped.

(b) How far did the New Deal encourage economic growth? [20]

This remains a matter of great debate among economists, especially given parallels with the Great Recession since 2008. The New Deal was intended to halt the decline in economic growth and to get Americans back to work again. Various reforms were passed to try and address both economic and social problems caused by the Great Depression. By 1937 the economy had recovered from the depths of depression in 1933, returning to its 1929 position. Then in 1937–8, there was a slight contraction in economic growth, often called the Roosevelt recession, as FDR introduced a more orthodox federal budget. In the late 1930s, economic growth returned so that by 1941 the economy was in line with the long term growth trends. Growth beyond that trend and the return of full employment only came with the outbreak of war. Thus some credit the New Deal with doing much to stimulate economic growth while others dismiss its importance compared with the onset of war. Some credit FDR with following Keynesian policies but Keynes did not publish his ideas until 1936. Candidates should be familiar with these arguments. A more recent study argues that aspects of the New Deal not usually mentioned, such as investment in road building, improved the infrastructure and helped encourage economic growth both in the 1930s and thereafter. The current orthodoxy about the New Deal and economic growth is that it made some but not a great deal of difference.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

Section C: International Option

International Relations, 1871–1945

9 International Relations, 1871–1918

(a) Why was the Franco-Russian Alliance of 1894 agreed? [10]

Appreciating Germany's vulnerable geographical position and the likelihood that France would be seeking revenge for defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, Bismarck had set about creating a series of defensive alliances designed to prevent Germany being attacked from three sides – by Russia from the East, Austria-Hungary from the South and France from the West. Rivalry between Russia and Austria-Hungary over the Balkans meant that his Dreikaiserbund had failed by 1879. The formation of the Triple Alliance in 1882 offered Germany some protection, but left it vulnerable to simultaneous attack from France and Russia. To prevent this, Bismarck had negotiated the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia in 1887. When Bismarck was dismissed from office in 1890, the German Kaiser Wilhelm (William) II began a more aggressive foreign policy and allowed the Reinsurance Treaty to lapse in 1890. Russia now felt both isolated and insecure. At the same time, France felt threatened by the existence of the Triple Alliance. Despite their political differences (France being a Republic while Russia was an absolute monarchy), relations between Russia and France had been steadily improving; indeed, from 1888 France, desperate to avoid being isolated and fearing Germany's power, had provided Russia with cheap loans to improve its military capabilities. By 1894, Russia and France signed the Dual Entente, a defensive alliance which offered both countries some security in the event of attack. It was agreed that the Dual Entente would remain in place as long as the Triple Alliance existed.

(b) How far do you agree that Japan had become a Great Power by 1914? [20]

In support of the view that Japan had become a Great Power by 1914, it could be argued that Japan had experienced rapid and highly impressive development under Emperor Mutsuhito and his Meiji government after 1867. Fearing that Japan might disintegrate in the same way as China had done in the face of European and American aggression, the newly centralised government began the process of rapid industrialisation and modernisation. Increasing prosperity enabled the development of Japan's military strength. As a result, Japan developed from a country threatened by the imperialistic ambitions of other nations, to one capable of becoming an imperial power in its own right. Japan was able to defeat China in war (1894–5) and gained recognition as a major power when it signed the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in 1902. In 1904–5, Japan was able to defeat one of the major European powers (Russo-Japanese War). By 1914, Japan was a modern industrial country, perceived as the champion of Asia against the Western powers.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that, despite its rapid progress, Japan had not yet become a major world power by 1914. Japan's success in the war against China, as confirmed by the Shimonoseki Treaty (1895), was curtailed by the Triple Intervention of Germany, France and Russia, all of which resented Japan's intrusion into an area in which they had vested interests. In forming an alliance with Japan in 1902, Britain had its own strategic motives – fear of isolation, concern over German naval developments and wishing to counter the threat which Russia was posing to British interests in the Far East. Although considered a major power, Russia was militarily weak, its navy outdated and widely dispersed, the majority of its troops based a long way away from the Far East. The alliance with Britain and victory in the war against Russia were opportunistic rather than symbolic of Japan's rise to major power status. Japanese expansion in East Asia had become a concern to the Western powers which were keen to protect and extend their own trading activities in

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

the region. The USA in particular saw Japan as a threat to what it considered the ‘open door’ to trading activities in China. Any further ambitions which Japan might have had in the region were, therefore, kept in check by the Western powers. It was not until WWI that Japan was able to expand its power and influence sufficiently to gain major power status.

10 International Relations, 1919–1933

(a) Why did the Locarno Treaties of 1925 offer new hope for lasting peace in Europe? [10]

The period from 1919 to 1925 was characterised by an uneasy peace in Europe, primarily because of France’s hard-line attitude towards Germany. Angry that the Treaty of Versailles had not imposed harsher terms on Germany and fearing the resurgence of German power, France had been uncompromising. For example, France had insisted that Germany meet its reparations requirements in full and, indeed, had occupied the Ruhr in 1924. With the Dawes Plan (1924) addressing French demands regarding German reparations, the meetings at Locarno seemed to mark a significant reduction in tension. French concerns regarding possible aggression by Germany in the future were allayed by the agreement that Germany, France and Belgium would respect their joint frontiers, an agreement which was guaranteed by both Britain and Italy. France seemed willing to adopt a more compromising and conciliatory approach towards Germany, symbolised by the effective working relationship which developed between Aristide Briand and Gustav Stresemann, Foreign Ministers of France and Germany respectively. The ‘Locarno spirit’ of reconciliation and compromise seemed to continue into subsequent agreements, leading one British statesman to declare that ‘The Great War ended in 1918. The Great Peace did not begin until 1925’.

(b) How justified were German criticisms of the Treaty of Versailles? [20]

In terms of ‘justified’, it could be argued that German representatives were not allowed to attend the peace conference and simply had to accept terms which were imposed on them. The terms were not based on Wilson’s Fourteen Points as Germany had expected. The restrictions imposed on Germany’s armed forces might leave it vulnerable to attack, since it was clear that none of the victorious nations intended to disarm, and make it difficult to ensure law and order in Germany itself at a time of intense political instability. Although classed as mandates, Germany’s former African colonies were effectively taken over by Britain, France and South Africa. Millions of people who were ‘German’ in terms of language and culture would now be living under foreign rule (e.g. in Poland and Czechoslovakia). East Prussia was split from the rest of Germany by the Polish Corridor. The War Guilt clause seemed harsh given the complicated events which led to WWI. The amount settled for reparations seemed unreasonably high and beyond Germany’s capacity to pay.

In contrast, it could be argued that, having ignored Wilson’s Fourteen Points when imposing harsh terms on Russia in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, Germany had little right to expect them to form the basis of the Treaty of Versailles. Germany’s territorial losses in Europe were restricted to those areas which it had gained as a result of previous wars. Economically, Germany retained the potential to revive as the strongest power in Europe. The terms were not as severe as Clemenceau had wished. French desire for revenge and a guarantee of security against possible future German aggression had been tempered by Wilson’s desire to ensure a fair and lasting peace and Britain’s desire for the German economy (which provided a significant market for British exports) to revive.

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

11 International Relations, 1933–1939

(a) Why did Mussolini adopt a more aggressive foreign policy after 1934? [10]

Mussolini's rise to power had been based on extreme nationalism and the desire to restore Italy to its former glories. The main aim of his foreign policy was to make Italy 'great, respected and feared'. However, despite the propaganda successes of the Fiume and Corfu incidents, Italy in the 1920s was in no position to challenge the major European powers and achieve Mussolini's aim of making the Mediterranean 'mare nostrum'. Between 1923 and 1934, Mussolini's foreign policy was cautious and largely designed to prevent Italy, as the only fascist state, becoming isolated and vulnerable. This cautious, diplomatic approach was symbolised by his effective contributions to the Locarno meetings. By 1934, Mussolini was widely respected abroad, but was facing problems at home. With Italy suffering a severe depression, Mussolini's popularity was declining. He desperately needed a propaganda boost. Italy's invasion of Abyssinia in 1935 provided this, for Mussolini was able to claim success where earlier attempts had failed. The League of Nations imposed only minor sanctions against Italy, enough to irritate but not enough to stop Mussolini. This alerted Mussolini to the weakness of France and Britain, and he began to see Hitler's Germany (whose growing power he had formally feared) as a better ally to ensure Italy's security and power. Mussolini's growing infatuation with Hitler led Italy into involvement in the Spanish Civil War and, eventually, the Pact of Steel.

(b) To what extent was Franco's victory in the Spanish Civil War due to the support he received from Germany and Italy? [20]

It could be argued that the support which Franco received from Germany and Italy proved decisive. Italy had provided over 50 000 troops and considerable air power. Germany had provided untold numbers of planes and tanks. The German bombing of the Basque town of Guernica, in which over 1600 civilians were killed, was not untypical of the methods used to ensure the creation of a new fascist state. While Italy and Germany continually ignored the non-interference strategy adopted by the League of Nations, Britain and France observed it fully. Although the Republican side did gain some support from the USSR and International Brigades, this did not provide anything like the same level of military power and expertise available to Franco's Nationalists.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that Franco's victory owed more to the fact that he was able to maintain the unity of the various right-wing groups which made up the Nationalists (church, army, monarchists, Falange). In contrast, the Republican side was far less unified, the various left-wing groups (e.g. socialists, communists, anarchists) all having their own, often contradictory, aims. Unlike the well-trained professional soldiers under Franco's command, the Republican forces were simply armed workers who lacked military organisation and discipline. Fearful of antagonising Hitler and Mussolini, Britain and France were unprepared to assist the Republicans. As a result, the League of Nations took no action against foreign intervention in the Spanish Civil War, leaving the Republicans vulnerable to the more organised Nationalist forces.

Page 14	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014	9389	21

12. China and Japan, 1919–1945

(a) Why was the Kuomintang successful in the period from 1925 to 1928? [10]

Prior to Sun Yat-sen's death in 1925, the KMT had made little progress, most of China remaining in the control of warlord armies. Chiang Kai-shek, who emerged as leader of the KMT in 1925, realised that the warlords would have to be defeated if the KMT were to be able to unify China. As head of the Whampoa Military Academy and having received military training in Moscow, Chiang set about creating an efficient army with which to tackle the power of the warlords. In July 1926, Chiang began the Northern March and, by 1928, Peking had fallen and the KMT had effective control over China. The KMT's success can be attributed to a number of factors, such as:

- KMT forces (the National Revolutionary Army) were far better organised than the armies of the warlords
- The NRA was equipped with modern weapons supplied from Russia and Germany
- Ordinary Chinese people, weary of the power of warlords, welcomed and supported the KMT forces. Many joined the NRA, which grew from 100 000 in July 1926 to 250 000 by the end of the year
- Russian military advisers assisted the NRA. Stalin believed that China would be a useful ally, helping to end Russian isolation
- Peasants, factory workers, shopkeepers, merchants and businessmen were all attracted by the KMT's Three Principles (nationalism, democracy and land reform)
- Perhaps the most important factor was the support which the KMT received from the Chinese Communist Party.

(b) 'In terms of their political beliefs, Sun Yat-sen and Chiang Kai-shek had little in common.' How far do you agree with this statement? [20]

In support of the view, it could be argued that their very different backgrounds led them to have differing political views. Sun was the son of a peasant farmer, while Chiang was the son of a wealthy landowner. Sun had spent much of his life in the western world, exposed to western education and political ideas. Chiang was educated in China and Japan; he was steeped in Chinese culture and tradition and believed that their preservation was vital to China's resurgence. Sun was an intellectual and political philosopher, a thinker. Chiang was a soldier, a man of action. Sun was a firm believer in the Three Principles – nationalism, democracy and land reform – and was a keen advocate of social reform. Chiang was less interested in social reform and was keen to defend the power and rights of the rich landowners, industrialists and businessmen. Sun could see the benefits of the KMT's alliance with the Chinese Communist Party. Chiang saw the communists as an embarrassing ally and, from 1927, began a purification movement to remove communists from the KMT.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that the two men shared a total commitment to Chinese nationalism; the development of a unified country independent of foreign influence and interference. Prior to Sun's death in 1925, they had worked closely together in great friendship to develop the strength of the KMT. Sun had selected Chiang to lead the development of the KMT's army, sending him for military training in Moscow and putting him in charge of the military academy at Whampoa. For the KMT to achieve success, it required the combined talents of both men – the political wisdom of Sun and the military know-how of Chiang.