



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY

9489/42

Paper 4 Depth 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.

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.

AO2 – Demonstrate an understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and a substantiated judgement of key concepts: causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context, the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.		
<i>This mark scheme assesses the quality of analysis demonstrated in addressing the question.</i>		
Level 5	<p>Answers demonstrate a full understanding of the question, are balanced and analytical.</p> <p>Answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish valid and wide-ranging criteria for assessing the question • are consistently analytical of the key features and characteristics of the period • provide a focused, balanced argument with a sustained line of reasoning throughout • reach a clear and sustained judgement. 	13–15
Level 4	<p>Answers demonstrate a good understanding of the question, and are mostly analytical.</p> <p>Answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish valid criteria for assessing the question • are analytical of the key features and characteristics of the period, but treatment of points may be uneven • attempt to provide a balanced argument, but may lack coherence and precision in some places • reach a supported judgement, although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated. 	10–12
Level 3	<p>Answers demonstrate an understanding of the question and contain some analysis. Argument lacks balance.</p> <p>Answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • show attempts at establishing criteria for assessing the question • show some analysis of the key features and characteristics of the period, but may also contain descriptive passages • provide an argument but lacks balance, coherence and precision • begin to form a judgement although with weak substantiation. 	7–9
Level 2	<p>Answers demonstrate some understanding of the question and are descriptive.</p> <p>Answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attempt to establish criteria for assessing the question but these may be implicit • show limited analysis of the key features and characteristics of the period, and contain descriptive passages that are not always clearly related to the focus of the question • make an attempt at proving an argument, but this is done inconsistently and/or may be unrelated to the focus of the question • make an assertion rather than a judgement. 	4–6

Level 1	Answers address the topic, but not the question. Answers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focus on the topic rather than the question • lack analysis or an argument • lack a relevant judgement. 	1–3
Level 0	No creditable content.	0

AO1 – Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately and effectively.

This mark scheme assesses the quality and depth of knowledge deployed to support the argument made.

Level 5	Answers demonstrate a high level of relevant detail. Supporting material: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is carefully selected • is fully focused on supporting the argument • is wide-ranging • is consistently precise and accurate. 	13–15
Level 4	Answers demonstrate a good level of relevant supporting detail. Supporting material: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is selected appropriately • is mostly focused on supporting the argument • covers a range of points but the depth may be uneven • is mostly precise and accurate. 	10–12
Level 3	Answers demonstrate an adequate level of supporting detail. Supporting material: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is mostly appropriately selected • may not fully support the points being made, may be descriptive in places • covers a narrow range of points • occasionally lacks precision and accuracy in places. 	7–9
Level 2	Answers demonstrate some relevant supporting detail. Supporting material: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is presented as a narrative • is not directly linked to the argument • is limited in range and depth • frequently lacks precision and accuracy. 	4–6
Level 1	Answers demonstrate limited knowledge of the topic. Supporting material: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has limited relevance to the argument • is inaccurate or vague. 	1–3
Level 0	No creditable content.	0

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>‘A period of limited social change.’ Assess the view of Italy from 1925 to 1941.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The extent to which Mussolini succeeded in transforming Italian society can be viewed through his policies relating to the Catholic church, education and youth and women and families. He wanted to recreate Italian society in the fascist mould: tough, disciplined and obedient. Relations with the church were cemented by the Lateran Treaty and Concordat of 1929. There were, however, continued tensions, such as the dispute over the Catholic Action youth group in 1931 and Papal opposition to anti-Semitic policies in 1938. Catholicism remained a powerful influence in Italian society, despite fascist dictatorship.</p> <p>Fascism emphasised a traditional role for women and the regime tried to discourage girls from entering higher education and aimed to increase the birth rate through the Battle for Births from 1927. Evidence suggests that women generally did not accept their limited role, with many Italian women maintaining their role in the economy and with marriage and birth rates not increasing. There was some change in education policies, as the teaching profession was regulated by the Fascist Teachers’ Association, textbooks were re-written, and the cult of personality was heavily promoted. The ONB was set up as a youth organisation to further indoctrinate children, with attendance made compulsory in 1935. Education had some impact in decreasing illiteracy rates, as government spending on education increased and more children attended school for longer. The impact of fascism on young people’s attitudes was variable, with young people either absorbing them, conforming or resisting.</p> <p>Policies to unite all Italians tended not to affect the class structure, as Mussolini was generally keen to maintain the support of the traditional elite groups. Many Italians also took advantage of leisure opportunities offered by the Dopolavoro, with sporting facilities, theatres and drama societies, libraries, holidays etc. Probably the most popular of Mussolini’s social policies, it had 3.8 million members by 1939.</p> <p>An overall analysis of the extent to which Italian society was changed by Mussolini’s policies should be expected in order to assess the statement made.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Analyse the view that Stalin’s political skill was the main reason for his rise to power by 1929.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Points raised to agree with the stated factor might include how Stalin used Lenin’s funeral to advance his position, ensuring Trotsky’s non- attendance and acting as a pallbearer before making a speech designed to present himself as Lenin’s disciple. He was also prepared to take on administrative positions, which allowed him to build up a strong power base. He skilfully used his position as Party Secretary in order to control Politburo meetings. Furthermore, he was able to control key appointments through his roles in Orgburo and Secretariat to ensure his supporters were represented at regional and local level. His supervision of the ‘Lenin Enrolment’ led to an influx of young urban workers who were less interested in ideological debate and more attracted by Stalin’s policies. Stalin was also politically very skilful and cunning. He remained in the background and played the role of a moderate peacemaker. He played his opponents off against each other very effectively in the power struggle. His policy of ‘Socialism in one Country’ was popular and helped him to defeat the left in the power struggle. He then advocated rapid industrialisation to see off the right. Party members generally approve of his policies.</p> <p>Balance might be achieved by examining the mistakes and weaknesses of his opponents, chiefly Trotsky. For example, unlike Stalin, Trotsky did not have proletarian roots or was a long serving member, having only joined the Bolsheviks in 1917. There was a suspicion that he might attempt to assume dictatorship. Trotsky also had a great intellect but was considered by many to be arrogant and unwilling to build a power base in the party. He lacked the political skills that Stalin possessed and fatally underestimated the threat posed by Stalin. Lenin’s secret testament was critical of Stalin, but Kamenev and Zinoviev urged its suppression and Trotsky failed to intervene. Stalin could have been stopped at this point had Lenin’s opinions on him become more widely known.</p> <p>Analysis is expected to provide a supported judgement on the stated factor and to balance it against other factors to reach a conclusion based on a logical line of reasoning.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>'Hitler's foreign policy between 1933 and 1941 followed a clear plan'. Discuss.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Examples of Hitler's foreign policy aims could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revising and overturning the Treaty of Versailles • Re-uniting all German speakers in a Greater Germany • Lebensraum (living space) in Eastern Europe • Subjugation of 'inferior' races • Avoiding a war on two fronts <p>The debate around Hitler's foreign policy is based on the argument that he had either a master plan which was designed for war or that he was essentially a pragmatist who reacted to events, rather than shaped them. A compromise position, that Hitler did have a clear vision, but was prepared to be flexible within it, is also possible.</p> <p>The key events which might be used to support these arguments: From 1933 he wanted German equality and revoked the Treaty of Versailles, left the World Disarmament Conference and then the League of Nations. 1935 saw the Saar Plebiscite and the Anglo-German Naval Treaty, 1936 the reoccupation of the Rhineland, a decisive step, which showed neither France nor Britain would stand up to him at this stage. The Spanish Civil War was simply a chance to test his air force. The Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis was an anti-Soviet alliance and the Hossbach Memorandum of 1937 set out his future plans. 1938 saw the Anschluss and then the Munich Agreement handing Germany the Sudetenland. Hitler in his foreign policy was playing on the Pro-Appeasement policies of Britain and France whilst regaining territory taken at the Treaty of Versailles. 1939 was a decisive year in his occupation of Rump Czechoslovakia and the Nazi-Soviet Pact of August 1939. This latter was a Faustian pact between two dictators who distrusted each other. The Pact of Steel with Italy might be mentioned here too. September 1st and the invasion brought war and then Hitler's aims were to quickly conquer Western Europe which he did apart from Britain. In 1941 Germany launched Operation Barbarossa which had racial and economic and political motives.</p> <p>Examples of pragmatism might be seen in his actions in the Rhineland and his responses to the policy of Appeasement carried out by Britain and France. The Nazi-Soviet Pact might also be considered to be an example of inconsistency, given his earlier actions.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p data-bbox="316 248 1246 313">Analyse the reasons for the changing fortunes of the Liberal Party between 1919 and 1931.</p> <p data-bbox="316 349 549 383">Indicative content</p> <p data-bbox="316 418 1310 887">The Liberal Party had been in power for eight years leading up to the outbreak of World War I and was part of a coalition government from 1915. However, in the years after the war its fortunes declined, and it became the third party in British politics in the 1920s and would never form a government during the remainder of the twentieth century. Several reasons could be advanced to explain these developments. For example, decline had set in before the war, with the Liberal administrations losing support over their handling over issues such as Home Rule in Ireland, the women's suffrage movement and industrial relations. The party had also become deeply divided during the war itself. There was opposition to the growth of state power, including the introduction of conscription and two separate groups appeared following Lloyd George's ousting of Asquith from power, with Conservative support. In the 1918 election, Lloyd George and Asquith's wings campaigned separately.</p> <p data-bbox="316 922 1307 1122">Lloyd George was Prime Minister until 1922 but relied on Conservative support. The Liberal vote was split, ensuring that neither group could win an election. The lack of an effective national party meant that Lloyd George resorted to selling honours to raise money for campaigning. The resultant scandal harmed his reputation and encouraged the Conservatives to break from the post-war coalition.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1158 1299 1323">The rise of the Labour Party meant that working class voters were more likely to desert the Liberals. The British political system disadvantaged third parties, which is what the Liberals had now become. Even when the two groupings reunited and were funded by Lloyd George, they made little progress despite innovative policies.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1359 1299 1456">Analysis at the higher levels would require candidates to make a supported argument relative significance of different factors or how some might inter-link.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>‘Urbanisation was the most significant factor in bringing about social change by the end of the 1950s.’ Discuss.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The later 1940s and 1950s saw considerable social change. American society in 1945 had been rooted deeply in the past. A third of Americans lived in poverty; in rural areas half of the farms had no electricity. Road communications were often limited and many communities were cut off. A third of American homes had no running water. Though there had been some movement north in the war, most black Americans lived in the South under legal discrimination. There was limited indication of modern consumerism in many areas and urban centres and urban culture were separated from the bulk of the country. Urban growth played an important role in social change, expanding suburbs, encouraging migration from the countryside, leading to a greater racial mix outside the South, promoting consumerism. However, many of the social changes were linked to other factors – the social impact of the war; the changes in education; the growing demands for civil rights and greater equality; the development of a youth culture. Some resulted from urban growth but not all.</p> <p>Urbanisation and social change must be the focus of the question and answers could consider the greater social opportunities offered by urban growth, cultural developments, job opportunities, greater contact with different people, often higher wages and a more extended outlook than was possible in small town or rural USA.</p> <p>As well as that, there were housing problems, the retreat to the suburbs, decaying inner city areas, crime, racial tensions, pollution and challenges to existing attitudes which could be seen as undermining stability. Alternative elements which some might see as more significant might include greater awareness among ethnic minorities of social rights and inequalities; the changes in the role of women; the development of youth culture; changes in mass communication – but alternatives should be compared with the key element in the question to assess significance.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p>Evaluate the effects of the oil crises of 1973 and 1979 on the US economy.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>There were obvious negative effects – rising prices, shortages, consumer issues and issues to do with US industrial production. However, there were also some positives which could be discussed even if the effects were not long lasting. In the immediate period after the embargo was announced, the price of oil rose from \$3 per barrel to \$12. This had a major impact because of the reliance of the US economy for decades on fossil fuel. Internal trade and travel depended on cheap and abundant fuel. The US faced price rises and fuel shortages, causing inflationary pressures and putting the day-to-day operation of the economy at risk. The authorities called for measures to conserve energy, asking gas stations to close on Sundays and homeowners to reduce energy usage. In addition to causing major problems in the lives of consumers, the energy crisis was a huge blow to the American motor manufacturing industry, which had for decades made increasingly large and inefficient cars which would now be challenged by Japanese manufacturers producing smaller and more fuel-efficient models.</p> <p>Usually seen as negative, the crisis also had a more positive effect economically. Efforts were made to develop oil production in the US. There were also moves to reduce dependence on fossil fuels and find alternative sources of power, including renewable energy sources such as solar or wind power, as well as nuclear power. However, these were not developed much in the long term because after oil prices collapsed in the mid-1980s and prices dropped to more moderate levels, domestic oil production fell once more, while progress toward energy efficiency slowed and foreign imports increased.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
7	<p>Assess the consequences in the 1980s of the rise of the religious right.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The Christian Right had its origins in post-war fears of Communism and social change. Civil rights conflicts, Vietnam protests, the alternative youth culture, the women's liberation movement, the sexual revolution seemed to threaten traditional values. Supreme Court judgements such as Roe v Wade suggested that Christian fundamentalism needed political representation, The movement was led by some key figures – Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson. Originating with protestant fundamentalism, the wider 'Christian Right' attracted social conservative from other denominations. The world view of moral absolutes, the role of government to promote virtue, not interfere in economic activity had political implications. It led many to articulate opposition to government regulation and the toleration of dissent or unwelcome changes such as the Equal Rights Amendment. The political consequences may be seen in terms of the backing given to Reagan's campaign and opposition to the relatively liberal agendas of the Democrats in the 1980s even when they adapted their economic policies to a less interventionist approach. In social terms the religious right were influential in provoking opposition to rising divorce and the supposed threat to family values, to the rise of gay rights movements and opposition to abortion and Roe v Wade and to feminism. The consequences could be seen in terms of a revival of puritan attitudes and a growing reaction in the south-east and south central 'Bible Belt'. The rise in church attendance and the increased influence of religion in politics could be a major consequence as could the rise of influential figures like Phyllis Schlafly and a gulf between urban and rural USA and a generational gulf and a 'culture war' between reactionary and modernising elements which polarised the US.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
8	<p>‘The Marshall Plan was the most important factor in the US leadership of the global economy during the 1940s.’ Assess this view.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The Marshall Plan was formally known as the European Recovery Programme. It represented the US taking leadership by aiming to stimulate European production, to develop stable economies and to increase trade. As international trade was stagnating in the aftermath of war, this was seen as an example of US economic leadership and stood in contrast with the isolationism that followed the First World War. The plan delivered \$13.3 billion in aid to 16 countries. Two agencies coordinated the programme – the OECD and ECA. Recipients were obliged to promote trade and production. Admirers of the plan point out its positive impacts, European agricultural and industrial production were higher, the balance of trade and related ‘dollar gap’ much improved, and steps had been taken toward trade liberalisation.</p> <p>It could be argued that the Marshall Plan was an indication of new commitment by the US to end its non-interventionist policies of the inter war years which saw the dominant international economic power turn inwards despite the role played by the US in the Great Depression. The significance of the Plan was a linking of political and economic elements. The support given to the economies of Western Europe was associated with the espousal of liberal capitalism values, of free trade where possible and government interferences only when necessary for stability. Encouragement of free trade areas were part of a US global economic world view based on US economic strength. However, some may see the Bretton Woods agreement of 1944 as more significant and long lasting with the IMF and World Bank the high point of US economic leadership. The Bretton Woods agreement of 1944 created the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. It established the International Trade Organization which was hoped to be the basis for free trade which was the US hope for a more stable and prosperous world after the closed economic systems of the pre-war period. But the US Senate refused to ratify the Havana Charter of 1948 and the US and other nations ratified the GATT while waiting for the more ambitious ITO which would have set up a distinct organisation.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
9	<p>Analyse the extent to which President Kennedy was responsible for the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>It can be argued that President Kennedy was largely responsible for the onset of the crisis. The US people had been misled by his administration about the military imbalance between the superpowers. In the 1960 election campaign, he had spoken of a 'missile gap' in the Soviets' favour whereas in fact it was to the US advantage. He had also ordered the largest peacetime expansion of US military power including nuclear forces. This included deploying, from 1961, intermediate-range Jupiter nuclear missiles in Turkey which could be regarded as provoking the USSR. Moscow suspected that Washington, with its nuclear superiority, was attracted by the idea of a nuclear strike first. Kennedy's deployment of the Jupiter missiles was the main reason why Khrushchev sent missiles to Cuba. Kennedy and his civilian advisers understood that the missiles in Cuba did not alter the strategic nuclear balance but still attempted to force their removal. The president issued an ultimatum to a nuclear power which immediately created a crisis that could have led to catastrophe. He ordered a blockade on Cuba, an act of war which brought the world to the brink of a nuclear confrontation. The Cubans willingly accepted Soviet weapons, so the Soviet's deployment of the missiles was in accordance with international law. The blockade was illegal. Kennedy contemplated an invasion of Cuba to attack the Soviet missiles there. He also attempted to resolve a crisis he had largely created. According to the version of events propagated by the Kennedy administration, Washington refused Moscow's offer of 27 October for both sides to remove their missiles and instead forced a unilateral Soviet withdrawal.</p> <p>However, in the late 1980s the truth revealed that the crisis was resolved by a secret deal to remove both the Jupiter and the Cuban missiles. Kennedy in fact threatened to renege on it if the Soviets disclosed it. He did so for domestic politics and the maintenance of America's image as the indispensable nation. Khrushchev was also responsible as he miscalculated the effects of his actions and underestimated Kennedy who he believed was weak and inexperienced after the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion. He believed that Kennedy wanted to destroy the Castro regime. The Soviets wanted to deter US attacks, but they could have installed conventional weapons. It seems likely that Khrushchev wanted to appear to have greater military strength than the United States, particularly when U2 spy flights had shown that there was a missile gap in the US favour. Domestically, Khrushchev was under pressure to adopt a more hard-line approach to the West, and he needed to be successful to silence his critics. Appearing to defend the Cuban Revolution gave Khrushchev the opportunity to try to score a nuclear success over the Americans. He felt justified in his actions as the United States had stationed Jupiter missiles in Turkey. However, he underestimated the US reactions to threats in their own backyard and he also underestimated Kennedy. Kennedy did not want to be accused of weakness at home nor to be seen as weak in deterring the communist threat. Many contemporaries praised him for standing up to the USSR. His insistence that Soviet missiles be dismantled and taken away from Cuba earned him widespread support. Those nuclear weapons were a direct threat to American cities. Some historians have admired Kennedy's restraint in ruling out the options of an air strike against the missile bases or a military invasion of Cuba.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
10	<p>'The formation of SEATO was the most important consequence of US involvement in the Korean War.' Discuss this view.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The Korean War had a serious impact on US foreign policy and showed Truman the necessity of strengthening the US military position in the Far East, especially with North Korea remaining communist when the Korean War Armistice was signed in 1953. In 1954, Eisenhower made his 'Domino Theory' speech expressing his concern about the growth of communist influence in Indochina and the wider region. The South-East Asia Collective Defence Treaty, or Manila Pact, aimed to contain the spread of communism in the region by creating SEATO. The signatories to the Manila Pact were Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, Britain and the United States. The United States urged its allies in the region to stand up to the communists. The treaty aimed to protect the nations of Southeast Asia against possible communist aggression or subversion and to stabilise the areas facing a hostile Communist China, particularly in the Indo-China region. Although Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia were not official members of this treaty, they were also offered protection. This made the US obliged to assist Southeast Asian countries in the case of a threat from communist countries. However, SEATO had no joint command or standing forces. An attack on one member was not automatically seen as an attack on all. Each member could block any collective SEATO action. With French and British interest in the region declining, SEATO's effectiveness as a collective security organisation was debatable. When war broke out in South Vietnam, SEATO was unable to reach a consensus on intervention. The US tried unsuccessfully to make the Vietnam War a collective defence issue for SEATO but some of its members opposed the war.</p> <p>The United States managed to prevent South Korea falling into communist hands, arguably the most important consequence of the war both for South Korea itself and because the fear of the domino theory was to impact on US foreign policy decisions for the next 20 years. The war led to massive American rearmament. Their defence budget shot up to \$48 billion in 1951 and \$60 billion by 1952 and the arms race continued to escalate. Because of Japan's successful economic reconstruction and China's rise in Asia during the Korean War, American policy makers began to regard South Korea as a buffer zone between the Communist World and the Free World. The United States still refused to normalise relations with the People's Republic of China, a situation that remained until the 1970s. China's involvement in the war meant that it lost the opportunity to unite Taiwan with China. Truman had assumed that Taiwan would inevitably fall to Beijing, but the outbreak of the Korean War prompted him to intervene again and send the Seventh Fleet to neutralise the Taiwan Strait. US efforts to save South Korea from Communist invasion accelerated attempts to restore Japan to a respected international position and make that country a prosperous ally of the United States. The Treaty of San Francisco 1951 ended the state of war between Japan and 47 of the Allies; it concluded the American Occupation and excused the Japanese from reparations for the war. The treaty allowed the United States to station troops in Japan and made the Japanese islands into an important part of the US global containment structure. To American leaders, Japan was transformed from World War II enemy to vital ally, and Korea went from a peripheral region to a key battle ground in the Cold War.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
11	<p>Assess the extent to which superpower involvement affected Ethiopia during the Cold War.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The 1974 overthrow of the regime of Haile Selassie in Ethiopia by a clique of Marxist officers known as the Derg shook what had previously been a relatively stable regional order. As political unrest overcame Ethiopia and the Derg grew increasingly radical, ethnic insurgencies by Eritreans, Oromos, Tigrayans, Afars, and Ogadens flared on the borders of the former Ethiopian empire. Eritrea, which been in rebellion since 1960, was home to the most serious insurgency. The burden of these rebellions placed a massive strain on Ethiopia. Ogaden Somalis held deep ties with their kin on the Ethiopian side of the border and Somalia dreamt of a 'Greater Somalia' that incorporated ethnic Somalis living in Ethiopia. Barre's Somali regime initially sought to achieve this goal through irregular warfare. The Ethiopian government in these regions existed in a state of siege and effectively ceded control over the countryside. After guerrilla assaults in the spring of 1977 failed to secure any major towns, Somalia deployed conventional forces to try to achieve its political goal.</p> <p>However, superpower rivalry put more weapons at Somalia's disposal. As the Cold War heated up, the USSR joined the United States in the struggle for power and influence in the Horn of Africa. In 1963, the USSR signed a military assistance pact with Somalia. In 1964, the First Ogaden War between Ethiopia and Somalia broke out and the Ethiopian government, backed by the United States defeated the Somalis. Fearing the loss of Ethiopia to the Soviets, US arms shipments continued in reduced quantities after Selassie's fall but the Marxist Derg, needing vast amounts of military equipment because of the Eritrean insurgency, also sought Soviet assistance. In July 1977, defying Moscow, the Soviet-equipped Somali National Army invaded the Ogaden. By August 1977, the Soviets began to come down firmly in support of Ethiopia. They reduced aid to Barre who expelled all Soviet advisers from Somalia in November 1977. Barre believed that the United States would now supply him with arms. Soviet aid poured into Ethiopia and 17 000 Cuban combat troops, arrived tipping the military balance in favour of the Ethiopians. Ethiopia's leaders, already faced with insurgencies and growing opposition to radical policies, feared the country was falling apart. Soviet arms were being used by the Somalis to destroy Ethiopia when the Soviets had assured Ethiopia that it could safely reduce its forces in the east without fear of a Somali attack. The Western powers, appalled at Somalia, cancelled arms sales. In January 1978 the Ethiopian forces unleashed a massive counterattack. With his army expelled from the Ogaden, Barre again called for Western military aid. The shock of the Soviet intervention ultimately led Carter to adopt Somalia as a Cold War ally.</p> <p>The Ogaden War had catastrophic consequences for East Africa. Ethiopia's victory with Soviet support did not result in improvements for the people. In Ethiopia up to 500,000 were killed as a result of the Red Terror, from forced deportations or from the use of hunger as a weapon under Mengistu Haile Mariam's rule. The Derg, with continued Soviet backing, pursued an ambitious programme that included collectivisation, intensive farming methods, and the nationalisation of forest areas. These reforms, combined with a drought decimated Ethiopian agricultural output and sparked a severe food shortage. By 1985, an estimated one million Ethiopians had died in the famine. Under Gorbachev aid to Ethiopia was reduced causing more economic hardship.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
12	<p>Assess the extent to which persecution of Jews in Europe led to the creation of the state of Israel.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>During the 19th century, Jews in Eastern Europe faced growing persecution. An independent Jewish national movement first began to emerge in the Russian Empire. In 1896 Theodor Herzl asserted that establishing a Jewish state was the solution to growing antisemitism in Europe. In 1897, the Zionist Organisation was founded with the aim ‘to establish a home for the Jewish people in Palestine’. However, Zionism was regarded with suspicion by the Ottoman rulers and was unable to make major progress. Between 1904 and 1914, around 40 000 Jews settled in the area now known as Israel. Persecution had resulted in many Jews fleeing to Palestine and the Zionist movement spent many years building the political and economic infrastructure for an eventual Jewish state.</p> <p>However, the persecution of Jews during the Holocaust meant that many Jews in the diaspora who had previously been opposed to Zionism were convinced of the need for Jewish statehood. This led many diaspora Jews, especially those in the United States, to become vocal advocates of the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. American Jews also provided much-needed money and arms to Jews in Palestine to help them develop and defend such a state. The mass mobilisation of American Jewry in support of Jewish statehood after World War II undoubtedly played a role in persuading the US government to support the partition of Palestine in the UN vote in November 1947, and then to immediately recognise the State of Israel after it was declared. President Truman was concerned about winning the influential Jewish vote in the presidential election of November 1948, and he was subjected to intense lobbying by American Jewish Zionists. American public opinion was deeply affected by the Holocaust, and consequently the United States became more supportive of Jewish statehood in its aftermath. President Truman showed genuine sympathy for Jewish suffering in the Holocaust and for the plight of Jewish Holocaust survivors.</p> <p>However, US foreign policy was driven by the need to resettle up to 250 000 Jewish refugees and displaced persons in Europe and by a desire to avoid a war in Palestine that might destabilise the Middle East and be exploited by the USSR. Some American policymakers also expected a Jewish state to be democratic and pro-Western. In the context of the emerging Cold War US strategic interests shaped American foreign policy more than humanitarian concerns for Holocaust survivors. The British opposed Jewish statehood: they wished to maintain good relations with Arab states whose plentiful oil supplies they needed. Palestine had been under the control of the British since 1917 and formally became a British mandate of the League of Nations in 1923. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 had stated that Britain favoured a national home for the Jewish people but did not want to prejudice the rights of non-Jewish communities. In 1945 the British confirmed that there would be no increase in immigration and no separate Jewish state. The Zionists, however, were convinced that they had international public opinion on their side and decided on a policy of active opposition to British rule in Palestine. After the war they made use of propaganda and lobbied members of the US government and Congress. The British government, unable to reach an agreement, referred the problem to the United Nations in 1947 and announced it would withdraw from Palestine on 18 May 1948. It was this decision to withdraw and relinquish control that enabled the UN decision on partition.</p>	30