



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY

9489/22

Paper 2 Outline study

May/June 2023

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2023 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **21** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Part (a)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 4	Connects factors to reach a reasoned conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers are well focused and explain a range of factors supported by relevant information. Answers demonstrate a clear understanding of the connections between causes. Answers reach a supported conclusion. 	9–10
Level 3	Explains factor(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers demonstrate good knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. Answers include explained factor(s) supported by relevant information. 	6–8
Level 2	Describes factor(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers show some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. (They address causation.) Answers are/may be entirely descriptive in approach with description of factor(s). 	3–5
Level 1	Describes the topic/issue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers contain some relevant material about the topic but are descriptive in nature, making no reference to causation. 	1–2
Level 0	No creditable content.	0

Part (b)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 5	Responses which develop a sustained judgement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers are well focused and closely argued. (Answers show a maintained and complete understanding of the question.) Answers are supported by precisely selected evidence. Answers lead to a relevant conclusion/judgement which is developed and supported. 	17–20
Level 4	Responses which develop a balanced argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. Answers develop a balanced argument supported by a good range of appropriately selected evidence. Answers may begin to form a judgement in response to the question. (At this level the judgement may be partial or not fully supported.) 	13–16
Level 3	Responses which begin to develop assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. Answers provide some assessment, supported by relevant and appropriately selected evidence. However, these answers are likely to lack depth of evidence and/or balance. 	9–12
Level 2	Responses which show some understanding of the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	5–8

Level 1	Descriptive or partial responses <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Answers contain descriptive material about the topic which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment on the question which lacks support.• Answers may be fragmentary and disjointed.	1–4
Level 0	No creditable content.	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>Explain why living conditions in cities and towns were bad for the lower classes as a result of industrialisation.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urbanisation was rapid and unplanned. The prevailing attitude of laissez-faire meant government did not see it as their job to regulate on such things as housing, sewage, and water supply. This only began to change, slowly. • Urban centres grew because people were attracted to them for work in the factories, mills, and mines. This led to over-crowding in low quality housing and insanitary conditions. Cities and towns became breeding grounds for diseases such as cholera, typhus, and TB. • Pollution from the surrounding industries added to the unhealthy atmosphere of cities and towns. • Many amongst the middle and upper classes felt that the lower classes themselves were to blame for the conditions they lived in. The cost of any changes to living conditions would be met by ratepayers, the middle and upper classes. This hindered the efficacy of attempts at improving conditions. The Public Health Act (1848) was ‘permissive legislation’ – local authorities may adopt its provisions, but they did not need to (‘compulsive legislation’). <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>‘Chartism emerged in 1838 because trade unions were weak.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Arguments to support this view could be as follows. The Industrial Revolution had resulted in profound changes to working and living conditions for the lower classes. To get improvements in these conditions the lower classes needed parliament to take up their case. They had to influence the political process. Trade unions, however, did not offer a way to influence the political classes. Government, be it Whig or Tory, saw unions as a potential threat to the social order and acted harshly, e.g. the Combination Acts (1799 and 1800) and the Tolpuddle Martyrs (1834). Membership of trade unions, also, was low – the Grand National Consolidated Trade Union (GNCTU) only had 10 000 members. In times of declining trade, as in 1836, membership of trade unions fell. The Combination Acts were repealed (1824) but trade unions were still subject to restraints which made them ineffective as a means to influence the political process.</p> <p>However, there were other factors which led to the emergence of Chartism in 1838. The Great Reform Act of 1832 seemed to offer hope to the lower classes as it showed what a well organised campaign (demonstrations, meetings, pamphlets, and newspapers) with the support of large numbers could achieve. The reformed parliament, however, acted no differently to previous parliaments and ignored the concerns of the lower classes. The Municipal Corporations Act of 1835 further excluded the lower classes from the political process. The vote for town councils was extended to all ratepayers, but to pay rates you needed to own property, and few members of the lower classes did so. Therefore, they were unable to influence their lives in their own localities. This lack of control was seen, also, in regard to the New Poor Law Amendment Act (1834). This law showed how much control parliament had over the daily lives of the lower classes, and how little control the lower classes had over their own lives. A vote on the repeal of the law was defeated 309 votes to 17 votes. Therefore, seeking to influence parliament would not work, change would only come once the lower classes entered parliament.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p>Explain why relations between Prussian liberals and Bismarck improved in the period 1864–1871.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prussia was victorious in the war with Denmark (1864) over the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. By the treaty of Vienna, the duchies were to be jointly administered by Prussia and Austria. In 1865 the Convention of Gastein ended this joint administration and Schleswig was administered by Prussia. Thus, Prussia had gained additional territory. Prussian liberals favoured German nationalism which led to some improvement in relations. • The Zollverein contracts were running out in 1865. They were successfully renegotiated to Prussia's advantage by Bismarck's government. Thus, material considerations helped to bring some improvement in relations. • In 1866 Prussia swiftly defeated Austria in what became known as the 'Seven Weeks' War'. Prussia received extensive land gains (Holstein, Hesse-Cassel, Hanover, Nassau, and Frankfurt). All other German states north of the river Main, including Saxony, were to be formed into the North German Confederation (NGC) under Prussian leadership. It seemed that the creation of a unified German state was moving ever closer. This did improve relations. For example, only seven votes were cast against an Indemnity Bill introduced by Bismarck. It asked parliament to grant an indemnity for any actions taken by the government, without parliament's consent, during the previous four years. • Victory over Austria meant that two thirds of all Germans, excluding German Austrians, were now part of the Prussian dominated NGC. For many liberals it appeared unification was happening, even if carried out by force, and there was some acceptance that the end justified the means. A large section of the Liberal Party formed themselves into the National Liberal Party, pledged to support Bismarck in his nationalist policy. • Victory in the war with France (1870–71) led to a popular demand in the four southern German states to turn a wartime alliance into a permanent union. In November 1870 treaties were signed with these states who agreed to join the German Empire. In January 1871 the king of Prussia becoming the German Emperor. Thus, the goal of a unified Germany held by liberals had been achieved through Bismarck's policies. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p>‘The Zollverein’s role was economic not political.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Arguments to support this view may consider how, after 1815, the 39 states of the German Confederation managed their own economies. This created innumerable customs barriers and internal tariffs restricted trade. Therefore, to try and tackle these problems several customs unions had been formed. For example, in the north, the Prussian Customs Union (PCU), in the south the Bavarian and Württemberg and Middle German Commercial Union (MGCU). In 1831 the MGCU collapsed, and Hesse-Cassel joined the PCU, as did Bavaria and Württemberg in 1834. Hesse-Cassel was no doubt prompted by the fact that the cost of securing tariff borders and tariff administration had cost her 100% of her tariff income prior to 1830. Therefore, the enlarged PCU, the Zollverein, was a means to achieve increased trade and prosperity by abolishing customs duties. The Zollverein followed on from these previous customs unions. It was, also, aligned with the increasingly popular idea of free trade – doing away with as many internal trade barriers as possible for goods to move more freely. The Zollverein began attempting to unify both the currencies and weights and measures used by its member states. Economic considerations influenced Austria to remain outside the Zollverein. She disagreed with free trade as within her Empire she had large markets for her home-produced goods. Austria wanted high import duties to protect her industries and markets from cheap imports. If she had joined the Zollverein, then these duties would have to be reduced to the same level as the other member states.</p> <p>Responses challenging this view might discuss how the Zollverein was a means to help unite Prussia, in the east, with her distant Rhineland territories in the west. In this respect Hesse-Cassel membership was vital in helping to bridge the gap. In 1851 Hanover, Electoral Hesse and some lesser states joined the Zollverein, further rounding off this gap. It did have a clear political function. In 1830, before its creation, the Prussian finance minister had pointed out to his king that a free trade organization would not only bring prosperity to Prussia but isolate Austria, also. This isolation would lead to a weakening of Austria’s political influence over the other German states. Many argued that if the Zollverein, under Prussian leadership, brought economic advantages then it made sense to pursue a political union. From the 1840s the Zollverein was seen, increasingly, as a force for German unity and many northern German states saw Prussia as the natural leader of a united Germany.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p data-bbox="316 248 1134 282">Explain why the Tsar lost support between 1914 and 1917.</p> <p data-bbox="316 320 549 349">Indicative content</p> <ul data-bbox="316 387 1310 864" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="316 387 1310 454">• From the outset of the war Russia suffered military setbacks, at times on a catastrophic scale (Tannenberg and the Masurian Lakes).<li data-bbox="316 454 1310 521">• The Tsar's decision in 1915 to take personal command meant that he would be blamed personally for all defeats.<li data-bbox="316 521 1310 656">• His presence at the front threw attention on his wife who was resented for being German and having a close relationship with Rasputin, which was regarded as unseemly, and the lurid rumours only weakened support further for the Tsar.<li data-bbox="316 656 1310 790">• Russia's economy was incapable of dealing with the demands put upon it by the war. There was high inflation and food shortages, which combined with the bad news from the front further eroded support for the Tsar.<li data-bbox="316 790 1310 864">• The combination of military setbacks and domestic disharmony led the military to demand the Tsar's abdication. <p data-bbox="316 898 759 931">Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p>‘Agreeing to the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was a misjudgement by the Bolsheviks.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Arguments to support the view might consider how the terms of the treaty were punitive for Russia. Her hegemony over the Baltic states was ceded to Germany and they were to become German vassal states under German princelings. In about one third of European Russia, stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea and including Ukraine (her major grain source) was ceded to Germany or her allies. Russia lost 34% of its population, 54% of its industrial land, 89% of its coalfields and 26% of its railways. In addition, she had to pay a fine of 300m gold marks. Many amongst the Bolshevik leadership were appalled at the terms and Lenin only got his way by a majority of one in a crucial committee division. Whilst the treaty ended the war with Germany it did not mean the end of conflict for the Bolsheviks. The Allied Powers saw the Bolsheviks’ actions as a betrayal of their cause, and this led them to think about military intervention in Russia. Russian nationalists were furious and joined forces to fight the Bolsheviks. Whilst Trotsky might blame ‘petty-bourgeois compromisers’ for the treaty others did not and put the blame on the Bolsheviks.</p> <p>However, there is a case to be made that the acceptance of the treaty was not a misjudgement but served the Bolsheviks’ purpose. Lenin knew that the Russian people were exhausted by the war and wanted peace. This was why ‘Peace’ had been at the forefront of his ‘Peace, Land and Bread.’ Russia was exhausted militarily, and this made it impossible to fight on successfully, it would be futile to do so. Both the Tsar and the Provisional government had been overthrown for continuing to pursue the war and Lenin could not risk this as the Bolsheviks grip on power was quite limited at this stage anyway. The Bolsheviks were international revolutionaries with a limited loyalty to Russia. They believed History was on their side as a great proletarian revolution was about to sweep across Europe. Their first concern was spreading the proletarian revolution. Conflict between nations would be replaced by class conflict. Lenin judged correctly the situation facing the Bolsheviks. If Germany won the war, it would retain the Russian territory it now held, but if she lost then Russia might be able to regain its lost lands. The first outcome meant that the Bolsheviks had not made Russia worse off and the second would mean they had made Russia better off, but even if this did not happen it was still better for the Bolsheviks to use peace to consolidate their hold on power so any possible outcome would be helpful to the Bolsheviks.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	<p>Explain why the Missouri Compromise was agreed in 1820.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Missouri Compromise was agreed to maintain the balance of power in Congress between slave and non-slave states. As part of the Compromise Missouri was admitted to the Union as a slave state and Maine as a free state. The Compromise also prohibited slavery, above the 36°30' latitude line (much of this land was part of the Louisiana purchase). • The entry of Missouri into the union had been causing conflict for a few years. In 1819, the Tallmadge amendment attempted to prohibit the further introduction of slaves into Missouri and provided for emancipation of those already there when they reached the age of 25. The amendment passed the House of Representatives, controlled by the more-populous North, but failed in the Senate, which was equally divided between free and slave states. This deadlock was broken by the agreement of the Compromise to admit both Missouri and Maine. • Although the compromise measures appeared to settle the slavery-extension issue, John Quincy Adams noted in his diary, 'take it for granted that the present is a mere preamble—a title page to a great, tragic volume'. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	<p>‘The rise of the Republican Party was the main cause of increased sectional tensions in the 1850s.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Possible discussions about the rise of the Republican party might include how the foundation of the Republican Party in Ripon, Wisconsin in 1854 built upon existing sectional tensions. The party’s main aim was to prevent the spread of slavery in the territories which the disintegrating Whig Party had failed to do. It was a political party which was clearly aimed at just the Northern section and was designed to fight for their views. This caused outrage amongst many Southerners even those who had previously regarded themselves as moderate. It showed that the political system was becoming increasingly split along sectional lines. Also, the disagreements over Kansas–Nebraska Act saw the Republicans rapidly gain support in the north and in 1856 their first presidential candidate, John C. Fremont, won 11 of the 16 Northern states.</p> <p>Possible discussions about other causes of sectional tension in the 1850s might consider the application of the Fugitive Slave Act which was included in the Compromise of 1850 caused sectional tensions to increase. Many Northerners felt that being made to capture and return fugitive slaves was against their constitutional rights. On the other hand, Southern public opinion felt it was part of the commitment of the Compromise to not destroying slavery completely. The continuing discussions over the Fugitive Slave Act meant that tensions were constantly being brought to the fore. Additionally, in 1854, the Kansas–Nebraska act was proposed to open the territory for building the Transcontinental Railroad. However, there was concern because the territory was North of the 36, 30 line and so slavery was forbidden under the Missouri Compromise. To resolve this Stephen Douglas proposed popular sovereignty in the state to allow settlers to decide whether it should be slave or free. Following the decision that Popular Sovereignty would be used the state was flooded by pro-slavery settlers and abolitionists wanting to vote in elections and decide how the state should be run. Two rival state capitals were set up; one that was pro-slavery in Lecompton and the abolitionists in Topeka. The tensions led to open warfare in the territory between pro and anti-slavery settlers; one example was the Battle of Osawatomie in 1856 where John Brown fought. The term ‘Bleeding Kansas’ was used to describe the conflict.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	<p data-bbox="316 248 1313 315">Explain why there were tensions in the relationship between the Union and Britain during the Civil War.</p> <p data-bbox="316 349 549 383">Indicative content</p> <p data-bbox="316 416 1313 517">With the outbreak of the Civil War the United States issued a global decree warning against foreign involvement but this did not prevent the involvement of foreign powers such as Great Britain.</p> <ul data-bbox="316 551 1302 994" style="list-style-type: none">• Although Great Britain remained officially neutral many private companies still traded with the Confederacy. A vast majority of the Confederate Navy was built in Liverpool during the war using private money, and the port also became the unofficial location for the Confederate embassy within Great Britain.• Not only were warships commissioned in Great Britain, so too were ships specifically designed to outrun Union blockade forces and smuggle illegal goods to and from Confederate controlled land.• The Confederate strategy for independence somewhat relied on British military involvement in the war but this never happened. The North threatened the British with war if they got involved and this would have cut off much of Britain's food supply. However, there were moments where war was close e.g. The Trent Affair 1861. <p data-bbox="316 1028 759 1061">Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	<p>To what extent had the lives of ex-slaves improved by 1877?</p> <p>Possible discussion on the positives of Reconstruction for ex-slaves might consider how the 1865 Thirteenth Amendment meant all slaves were freed. It took the Fourteenth Amendment of 1867 to make them citizens, equal in status with whites, and the Fifteenth Amendment of 1869 to give them the right to vote. These overturned many of the limits imposed in some states by Black Codes in 1865–66. The three amendments did much to improve the legal and political position of ex-slaves. Additionally, the legal provisions made by the three amendments went further than many could have imagined prior to the Civil War. Some 2000 ex-slaves were elected to official posts within Southern states. The Freedmen’s Bureau also did much useful work in the late 1860s, especially in establishing schools and colleges. Furthermore, Republicans in Congress passed three Reconstruction Acts in 1867, the main consequence of which was to impose military rule. The army was used to try and ensure that the rights of ex-slaves were respected and to limit the power of returning Confederates. This rule allowed an alliance of scalawags (Southern Unionists), carpetbaggers (Northern activists) and freedmen to try to reform Southern society along Northern lines. They made some limited progress.</p> <p>Possible discussion on the continuing difficulties for ex-slaves by 1877 might include how, though the Freedmen’s Bureau did much useful work in the late 1860s, especially in establishing schools and colleges, it was scrapped in the early 1870s when, to make a lasting difference, its contributions were needed for many more years. It also caused huge resentment amongst many white Southerners who disliked its aims and the involvement of federal government. Southern states also by-passed the federal legislation by passing ‘Black Codes’ (began in Mississippi 1865) to weaken the Reconstruction Amendments. Judgements of the Supreme Court in 1873 (the Slaughter-House cases) and 1875 (US vs Cruickshank) also limited the advances made by the post-Civil War amendments. In social and economic matters, the situation was much less positive. To make a living, ex-slaves turned to sharecropping, a system of farming which maintained the predominance of the white landowners. Before long, more conservative Southern whites gained office in the South while at the same time the federal government of Grant lost the strong will needed to impose social change on the South. The Compromise of 1877, by which the Republicans handed control of the South back to Democrats in return for keeping the presidency, was more a consequence of the changing reality of Southern politics than a cause. By 1877 the position of ex-slaves had certainly changed and broadly for the better. They had some opportunities, which benefited some. For many, however, the change was more in the letter of the law than the reality of their lives.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	<p data-bbox="316 248 1254 315">Explain why ‘Hoovervilles’ were built in some American cities after 1929.</p> <p data-bbox="316 349 549 383">Indicative content</p> <ul data-bbox="316 421 1295 864" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="316 421 1295 584">• ‘Hoovervilles’ was the name given to shanty towns and makeshift housing sites occupied by people impacted by the Great Depression. The name was meant to bring shame on President Hoover for doing nothing to help with unemployment or the crisis which America found itself in.<li data-bbox="316 591 1295 624">• Between 1928 and 1932 around 100 000 people a week lost their jobs.<li data-bbox="316 631 1295 689">• As they were unemployed, they could not pay their rent and were evicted from their homes.<li data-bbox="316 696 1295 792">• Many had nowhere else to go and so were forced to build temporary shelters with any waste materials they could find. These became shanty towns or Hoovervilles.<li data-bbox="316 799 1295 864">• Their existence highlighted the lack of help for people who were impacted by the Depression. <p data-bbox="316 898 759 931">Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
6(b)	<p>‘The Second New Deal was more progressive than the First.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Many commentators suggest that ‘The first New Deal focused on relief and recovery, the second on reform’.</p> <p>Possible discussion points include how the First New Deal of 1933–34 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. Also, much legislative and executive activity led to some relief and some recovery, if not a great deal of either. The Second New Deal of 1935–38 was more ambitious in its focus on reform as FDR articulated his vision of the future USA in 1934–35. 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. Furthermore, 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.</p> <p>When considering these ideas candidates should use some measure of ‘progressive’ to come to a judgement about the statement.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	<p>Explain why the Washington International Naval Conference was held in 1921–22.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General support for peace and disarmament after the First World War. • Women’s suffrage: disarmament had strong support from women’s groups and all major protestant groups in US – a ‘vote winner’. • US wanted to confirm its military position in the Pacific. • US concerns about growing Japanese strength. • Avoid a naval arms race like that before the First World War. • Concern over Japanese moves into China – wish by western powers to maintain the Open Door Policy in trade with China. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10
7(b)	<p>‘The Treaty of Saint Germain created more problems than it solved.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Discussion of the achievements of the Treaty might include how the treaty officially registered the breakup of the Habsburg empire, recognising the independence of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes (Yugoslavia) and ceding eastern Galicia, Trento, southern Tirol, Trieste, and Istria. Plebiscites eventually decided the fate of southern Carinthia (which went to Austria) and the town of Sopron (which went to Hungary). The Covenant of the League of Nations was integrally included in the treaty, and the union of Austria with Germany was expressly forbidden without the consent of the Council of the League. The military clauses limited Austria’s long-service volunteer army to 30 000 men and broke up the Austro-Hungarian navy, distributing it among the Allies. Although Austria was made liable for reparations, no money was ever actually paid.</p> <p>Discussion of the problems caused by the treaty might include how Austrian officials protested the violation of the principle of self-determination in the treaty, the placement of so many ethnic Germans under Czechoslovak and Italian rule, and the forbiddance of unity with Germany. The Austria created by the treaty was financially and militarily weak (declared bankruptcy in 1923) and therefore a chronic force of instability in Europe between the two World Wars. Just as the A–H Empire, all the successor states had significant minority populations which tended to create political instability and there was no history of democratic government. States were economically weak the integral infrastructure of the A–H Empire was broken up by new national boundaries and raw materials and manufacturing businesses were also sometimes separated by these boundaries.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	<p>Explain why Chamberlain felt that the Munich Conference had been a success.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Chamberlain returned from the Munich conference declaring ‘peace for our time’ because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A military invasion of Czechoslovakia was avoided.• The risk of war with Germany was avoided.• The agreement had the support of Britain’s main ally France and the backing of Mussolini from Italy.• Hitler had promised it would be his last territorial demand in Europe.• He received a hero’s welcome on his return with ‘peace for our time’. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
8(b)	<p>To what extent was the ineffectiveness of the League in the 1930s a result of the rise of dictatorships?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Discussion of the impact of dictatorships might include how Hitler's Germany had a substantial effect as Hitler was determined to undermine the Treaty of Versailles and the League was an integral part of that. Following his withdrawal from the world disarmament conference in 1932 he left the League and concentrated on undermining the Treaty of Versailles which also undermined the validity of the League which was unable to act when he remilitarised the Ruhr and set about re-arming Germany contrary to the Treaty. Also, driven by military dictatorship, Japan conquered Manchuria in 1932. The League objected but could do nothing and when the League supported China, Japan left the League. Encouraged by the examples of Japan and Germany, Mussolini, to bolster his flagging popularity, adopted a more aggressive foreign policy leading to the invasion of Abyssinia in 1935 and although the League officially condemned the Italians, France and Britain were caught making a secret agreement to give Abyssinia to Italy. Several countries, including the USA, ignored the League's attempt to impose economic sanctions. These crises destroyed the authority of the League, and it was powerless to stop Germany after 1935. By the time of the Sudeten crisis of 1938, Britain and France were ignoring the League, and were trying appeasement instead.</p> <p>Discussion of other factors might include that, from the start, structural weaknesses limited the League's effectiveness it was seen by some as a tool of the victorious powers. The incorporation of the League into the Treaties that ended the war also linked it permanently to the harsh terms of the Treaty and thus weakened support from those who were unhappy with the Treaty in general (not just the defeated powers). Additionally, the absence of the USA seriously weakened the League from the outset as Wilson had been one of the main architects of the League. The economic crisis caused by the Wall Street Crash also had a major effect. Leading countries like Britain and France became more focused on solving their internal difficulties. At the same time the economic and social problems increasingly polarised extremism in politics and produced the rise of dictatorship that ultimately undermined the League.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	<p>Explain why Yuan Shih-kai failed to establish a stable government in China.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Yuan was chosen as the first president of the newly declared Republic of China by both conservative and liberal leaders but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The treasury then was empty; the provinces were in the hands of local war lords and a permanent constitution was still in the making.• When his plan for a gigantic foreign loan was obstructed by the Kuomintang in the National Assembly, he ruthlessly murdered the chairman of the party and undermined the Assembly, thus bringing about a revolt against him in 1913 and losing Nationalist support by ending hopes of a new democratic constitution.• In 1915–16 he announced a new imperial dynasty with himself as emperor. This created opposition even among the conservative civilian and military forces that had supported him.• Widespread opposition, backed by Japan, forced him to abolish the newly announced monarchy in March 1916 and died three months later leaving division and chaos with no widely accepted central authority. <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	10

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	<p>‘Japan’s status as a Great Power was confirmed by the Paris Peace Settlement.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>In support of the view responses might discuss how the First World War permitted Japan, which fought on the side of the victorious Allied Powers, to expand its influence in Asia and its territorial holdings in the north equatorial Pacific. Japan declared war on Germany on August 23, 1914, and quickly occupied German-leased territories. Towards the end of the war, Japan increasingly filled orders for its European allies' needed war material, thus helping to diversify the country's industry, increase its exports, and transform Japan from a debtor to a creditor nation for the first time. Japan also went to the peace conference at Paris in 1919 as one of the great military and industrial powers of the world and received official recognition as one of the ‘Big Five’ nations of the new international order. Tokyo was granted a permanent seat on the Council of the League of Nations and the peace treaty confirmed the transfer to Japan of Germany's rights in China and some Pacific islands. Japan’s central role in the Washington Naval conference was recognition of Japan’s status.</p> <p>In challenging this view responses might consider how negotiations at Versailles were largely conducted by the ‘Big Three’ – Japan was not included. Rejection of ‘racial equality clause’ in Treaty of Versailles. Though it was broadly supported, the proposal did not become part of the Treaty, largely because of opposition by Australia and the United States. Its rejection was a cause for Japan's alienation from the other great powers and its increased nationalism and militarism that would lead up to the Second World War. At the Washington Naval Conference Japan had to accept a lower allocation of capital ships than USA and Britain and in the nine Power Treaty had to agree to withdraw its troops from Shandong and Siberia (where it had been part of the international force opposing the Bolshevik Revolution). While these both had short term advantages for Japan in the long run, they fuelled the feeling that western powers were treating Japan as an inferior nation.</p> <p>NB arguments about whether Japan had achieved great power status before 1919 are not relevant to this question – it is specifically about whether they were treated as a great power in the negotiations and the outcomes.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	20