CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/23 Paper 2 (Outline Study 23), 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 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

Generic levels of response
Part (a)

Level 4: Evaluates factors **[9–10]**
Answers are well focused and identify and explain a range of factors. Answers are supported by precise evidence and demonstrate clear understanding of the connections between causes. Answers consider the relative significance of factors and reach a supported conclusion.

Level 3: Explains factors **[6–8]**
Answers demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question, providing relevant explanations supported by relevant and detailed information. Answers are clearly expressed. Candidates may attempt to reach a judgement about the significance of factors but this may not be effectively supported.

Level 2: Describes factors **[3–5]**
Answers show some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. Answers are either entirely descriptive in approach with few explicit links to the question, or they provide some explanation which is supported by information which is limited in range and depth.

Level 1: Describes the topic/issue **[1–2]**
Answers contain some relevant material but are descriptive in nature, making little reference to causation. Answers may be assertive or generalised. The response is limited in development.

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

Part (b)

Level 5: Responses which develop a sustained judgement **[18–20]**
Answers are well focused and closely argued. Arguments are supported by precisely selected evidence. They lead to a relevant conclusion/judgement which is developed and supported. They are fluent and well organised.

Level 4: Responses which develop a balanced argument **[15–17]**
Answers show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They develop a balanced argument supported by a good range of appropriately selected evidence. They begin to form a judgement in response to the question. At this level the judgement may be partial or not fully supported.

Level 3: Responses which begin to develop assessment **[10–14]**
Answers show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They provide some assessment, supported by relevant and appropriately selected evidence. However, these answers are likely to lack depth and/or balance. Answers are generally coherent and well organised.

Level 2: Responses which show some understanding of the question **[6–9]**
Answers show some understanding of the focus of the question. They are either entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support.

Level 1: Descriptive or partial responses **[1–5]**
Answers contain descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question. They may only address part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment on the question which lacks detailed factual support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. Answers may be fragmentary and disjointed.

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

Section A: European Option

Modern Europe, 1789–1917

1 France, 1789–1804

(a) Why did Louis XVI attempt to flee from France in 1791? [10]

The key issue is identification of a range of factors which led the King to try to leave France in 1791. He obviously had been insincere when it came to accepting the Constitution and remained totally opposed to the broad direction of the Revolutionary process. The influence of his wife may have been strong, but there is little evidence that he got much encouragement from those monarchs whom he saw as his potential saviours. Simple incompetence on his part is another factor which could be considered, particularly as there seemed to be no clear objective behind the flight. It is possible he hoped to return at the head of a victorious army to restore the 'status ante quo', but this was an unrealistic prospect in 1791.

(b) 'Political instability in France between 1789 and 1795 was caused by economic problems.' How far do you agree with this view? [20]

The key issue here is an analysis of a range of factors which led to constant instability during these years. A variety of factors need to be considered, ideally with clear prioritisation and good reasoning to support the prioritisation. Factors could start with the legacy of the Ancien Régime which inevitably led to unstable foundations – there had been centuries of authoritarian rule and no tradition of anything else had a chance to develop. There were huge underlying social and economic problems which forced their way to the front – even basics like the price of bread were to play a part. The role of the King was of course important, as was the role of the military and the aristocracy. There was simply no consensus of who should govern and how France should be governed, and with foreign intervention in the background there was bound to be tension. Often idealism was not matched by practical experience.

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–1850

(a) Why did the Industrial Revolution cause urbanisation? [10]

The key issue here is the growth of urbanisation during the industrial revolution period in France, Germany and the UK. There is a wide range of factors which could be considered. There was a mass migration from rural to urban areas – in the UK in 1760 around 16% of the population lived in cities; 80 years later it was 54% and this figure continued to rise. Figures are similar for France and Germany starting 40 years later. The subsistence/self-sustaining economy of the rural areas had gone and the growth of new farming techniques made sustaining a large urban population possible. Changes in transport and methods of production meant that there was a huge demand for an urban proletariat. Canals and railroads enabled people, goods and coal to be moved to urban centres.

(b) To what extent can mechanisation be seen as the main cause of the industrial revolution? Refer to any <u>two</u> countries in your answer. [20]

The key issue here is to identify what can be seen as the primary causes of the industrialisation process, and to analyse the extent to which mechanisation and technological advances were central causative factors when compared with many other factors. There is a case to be made as there could be no 'revolution' or radical increase in production without it, be it in agriculture or industry. Mechanisation in the form of seed drills or flying shuttles, steam engines or sophisticated pumping systems for canals was invariably critical for all stages of the rapid growth in production, be it importing raw materials, providing the energy for the factories or working the machines themselves. There would have been only stagnation without it. Mechanisation led to a rapid drop in prices and the actual creation of a mass market – it is vital whatever way it is looked at. However, there are a number of other factors which could be developed, ranging from political stability, laisser faire attitudes, the stimulus of war, the availability of raw materials, a sophisticated banking and capital raising process and the 'right' attitude of government. It could well be argued that it was vital, but so were other factors.

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

(a) Why was there a crisis over Morocco in 1905–06? [10]

The key issue here is to explain the reasons why what in one sense was a minor incident almost led to war. The French very much saw Morocco as part of 'their' sphere of interest and resented any idea of German 'gains' in the area. The fact that the Kaiser actually went there (although not personally keen on the idea) heightened the tension. The German Foreign Office was deliberately trying to provoke the French, but they had been under criticism for not doing enough to support German economic interests in North Africa. Germany was deliberately trying to provoke the French and weaken the entente. The British naturally saw any German naval developments in the Mediterranean as a threat to their holdings there and the Suez route to India.

(b) 'Britain must take responsibility for the outbreak of World War 1.' How far do you agree with this view of the causes of World War 1? [20]

The key issue here is the degree of responsibility which Britain has to accept as a causative factor in the First World War. There is a case to be made. She did join the entente, well aware of the implications of it. There were also the military conversations with the French which also gave a degree of commitment to the French, and the UK government was only too well aware of the determination of the French to gain revenge for 1871. The naval race, with its dreadnaughts, was targeted firmly at Germany and there was the on-going imperial and commercial rivalry. The attitude towards Belgian neutrality was perhaps outdated. The British press and public opinion was, of course, very hostile to Germany.

There is obviously a strong case 'against'. Grey did much in July– August 1914, as well as earlier in the Balkans, to try and preserve peace .The reluctance of Asquith and some of the cabinet is a strong contrast to many other countries, Germany in particular. Equally strong cases, or even stronger, could be made for Russia, Austria, France and, of course, Germany itself. There are a large variety of possible answers, but balance and a well-supported case is looked for.

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905–1917

(a) Why were the Bolsheviks successful in October 1917? [10]

The key issue here is the reasons for Bolshevik success in 1917. The impact of the war was divisive and military support had drained away from the Provisional Government as it had from the Tsar. There were the main failings of Kerensky and the PG, the Kornilov affair, the continuation of the war and the arming of the Soviets being examples of this. Few wished a return to Tsardom with memories of autocracy and Rasputin still strong. There was a disastrous economic background with high inflation and real hunger. The Soviets had become powerful forces, central government had effectively broken down and there was anarchy in the countryside. Trotsky proved to be critical in the seizure and there were massive problems facing any rivals. Lenin, of course, provided much. He had built up the party and was prepared to think radically. His slogans were perfect for the time, his timing was good, his use of the press impressive and in the end he was prepared to step forward and take the necessary steps.

(b) 'The Tsar was secure on his throne in 1914.' How far do you agree? [20]

The key issue here is an analysis of the extent to which the Tsar's regime was secure and likely to last before the outbreak of the war. The period 1905–1914 is seen as a period of stabilisation and progress brought to an end by Sarajevo. Accepted thinking is often 'no war – no 1917'; some see the revolution as inevitable, given the inflexibility and incompetence of the Tsar and his regime, and the growing revolutionary upsurge after 1912. The Bolsheviks certainly started quite serious planning in 1913 and the war just delayed it – possibly. There was massive repression in the years 1905–1910, which arguably could have just alienated as well as repressed. There was a fairly apathetic and disorganised working class and a middle class apparently prepared to work within the structure.

However, there was a growing (c. 2.5 million) industrial work force, badly paid and treated, with a growing reputation for striking and radicalism, and hostile to middle class support. Increasingly by 1910, let alone 1914, many reformers were seeing the use of violence as the only way forward and the regime seemed to be getting progressively more reactionary. The Beilis case and the rise of Rasputin showed just how rotten the regime was. Peasants were leaving the land and heading for crowded cities and all that entailed, and the army's loyalty was beginning to be undermined. There is a valid case to be made each way, and the historical 'jury' is very much out on this one.

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 was the war with Mexico in 1846–48 important to the expansion of the USA in North America? [10]

This relatively short and one-sided conflict was important to US expansion in North America because it resulted in a clear victory for the USA and the gaining of a huge slice of territory known as the Mexico Cession. This territory, which totalled some 500 000 square miles, included lands which later formed three states – California, Utah and Nevada – most of Arizona, half of New Mexico as well as parts of two more – Colorado and Wyoming. This was in addition to Texas which had broken away from Mexico in 1836 and joined the USA in 1845. This gave the USA control of territory from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. The expansion coincided with many Americans adopting the idea of Manifest Destiny, justifying the USA's westward expansion. More particularly, gold was discovered in California just as it was being handed over to the USA, which caused the westward migration from the eastern USA and eventually growing links between the two halves of the USA.

(b) How serious a threat to the USA was the rise of Japan in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries? [20]

Japan was closed to virtually all westerners until the US expedition of 1853–54, led by Commander Perry. This opening of contacts, while still not great, led to the restoration of the Meiji dynasty in 1868, a government set on modernising Japan along Western lines. In the late nineteenth century, Japan introduced land reforms, developed a more industrial economy and modernised its armed forces with the help of Western military advisers. In 1895 China and Japan went to war over the control of Formosa. China lost, Formosa became independent and Japan gained Taiwan [Formosa] and Port Arthur on the mainland.

European great powers, alarmed by Japanese expansion, later intervened to try and limit her gains. In 1904, Japan and Russia fought over Port Arthur. Japan won. The USA intervened to help negotiate the peace treaty which ended the war. Japan was now the leading power of the western Pacific, strengthened in part by its 1902 military alliance with the UK, the world's leading naval power. While US governments expressed some concern about this expansion, it did not yet feel threatened by Japanese power or ambitions. The USA's main interest in the western Pacific was China, too big for Japan ever to control, and by the early 1900s it had acquired Hawaii as a significant fuelling stop on the way to China. Also the Philippines, acquired from Spain in 1898, was the western Pacific state which occupied more of its attention.

6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why in March 1864 did President Lincoln appoint Grant as head of the Union army? [10]

By early 1864, almost three years after the outbreak of the Civil War, the North had still failed to gain a clear military advantage over the South. In the previous summer, in the eastern theatre, Unionist forces had imposed a major defeat on the Confederates at Gettysburg. That merely repulsed a Southern advance into the North; the South itself remained intact. In the western theatre, however, the North had gained a significant advance when it gained control of Vicksburg, the last remaining Confederate town on the Mississippi. Control of Vicksburg gave the Unionists control of the whole river and thus divided Confederate forces in the area. The leader of the army which took Vicksburg was Ulysses Grant. The Unionist press publicised his successes. Congressional politicians wanted him appointed as lieutenant-general, a post last occupied by George Washington. In the spring of 1864, at the start of the new campaigning season, Lincoln invited Grant to Washington and appointed him head of all Unionist forces. 'Grant is the first general I have had', Lincoln said. By that he meant he had found someone prepared to take military decisions without seeking his approval. The needs of war and the talents of Grant had caused Lincoln to make this appointment. He was not to regret it.

(b) How far were civil liberties in the North sacrificed to the need to win the Civil War? [20]

In wartime, the executive often takes extra powers and limits democratic rights. In a civil war, this tendency becomes even more problematic than usual. Lincoln certainly gave the needs of war priority but not at the cost of abandoning all political freedoms. Elections still took place on time; just before the 1864 presidential election, Lincoln was pessimistic about his chances of defeating his rival, General McLellan. There was no great censorship of Northern newspapers, which reported events such as the New York draft riots of 1863.

The main limit on democratic rights introduced by Lincoln was the suspension of habeas corpus and the introduction of military courts to try those accused of giving comfort to the enemy. His best known example was the action taken against Clement Vallandigham, an Ohio Democrat who had been very critical of the conduct of the war. He had also described the president as 'King Lincoln'. A military court sentenced him to life imprisonment but Lincoln commuted this to banishment to the confederacy. The case caused considerable protest but in 1864 the Supreme Court ruled that it had no authority to overrule the president's use of military courts in wartime. The evidence is that these courts were used sparingly and mainly in border states or those close to the front line of fighting.

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

(a) Why were anti-trust laws introduced from the 1890s? [10]

Note the question states 'from' the 1890s. The main anti-trust laws were (a) the Sherman Anti-Trust Act 1890, and (b) two Acts in 1914, one setting up the Federal Trade Commission, the other, known as the Clayton Act, filling in gaps in the Sherman Act, e.g. price discrimination and mergers and acquisitions. The Acts were passed because of the growing tendency of American big business to establish cartels or monopolies usually labelled as trusts. The word has a broader legal meaning. In this context, a trust is a large private business, usually owning or linked with other businesses. Trusts such as Rockefeller's Standard Oil Trust faced increasing criticism for acting against the public interest; in 1911, it was forced to split into seven smaller companies. Thus the passage of anti-trust laws showed both the unpopularity of the trusts and the political organisation of groups and individuals opposed to their existence. Democrats were much keener on anti-trust legislation and action than were the Republicans. The US Supreme Court often limited the impact of anti-trust laws. This was one reason why the two Acts of 1914 were passed.

(b) 'The impact of the "robber barons", such as Carnegie and Rockefeller, was beneficial to the United States.' How far do you agree? [20]

There is some dispute about when the term 'robber barons' was first applied to leading industrialists of the later nineteenth century; some find contemporary evidence, others date it to a study in the 1930s. The term was first used of German barons in medieval times who preyed on those travelling by river, imposing excessive and usually illegal tolls for their own gain and the public's cost. The contrasting term for people such as Carnegie and Rockefeller is 'captains of industry', a term which is meant to emphasise their leadership qualities and the benefits they brought to the wider economy and society. Certainly people such as Rockefeller aimed to corner the market for a particular good or service – in his case kerosene oil. They did deals, often with railroad companies, to undercut rival companies and to gain – or steal – an advantage.

In an era with very limited personal or company taxation, they amassed huge personal fortunes. Left-wing writers of the early twentieth century, such as Ida Tarbell, who wrote a critical account of the History of the Standard Oil Company in 1904, helped develop the robber image of the great industrialists. More recently, in a more individualist age, some historians, usually more right-wing, have argued that the leading capitalists were successful market entrepreneurs and their actions benefited the ordinary people as well as themselves. Thus in the early twentieth century were formed the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation, supporting scientific research, education and the arts. The argument centres around the contrast between the exploitative nature of their economic work and the beneficial nature of their social work. Were they the Bill Gates of their time?

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

(a) Why did the Great Depression last so long? [10]

While exact dates depend on the measurements being used and thus are hard to agree on, most would accept that the Great Depression lasted for up to a decade, for most, if not all of the 1930s. It was rare for a slump to last this long; the so-called 'forgotten depression' of 1920–21 was over in a matter of months. The focus of this question is on the continuation of the Great Depression, on its durability in the New Deal era; its outbreak is covered in (b).

According to left-wing economists, FDR followed the policies needed to restore economic growth and reduce unemployment; he stabilised the banking system, he took the dollar off the gold standard, and the federal government led investment in infrastructure such as rural electrification. Yet unemployment remained stubbornly high and growth limited. In 1937–38, the so-called Roosevelt Recession occurred when FDR made attempts to balance the budget. Some more recent economic studies of the 1930s argue that the New Deal itself prolonged the depression. The argument is that government intervention, especially via the NIRA, allowed companies to charge higher prices and inflate wages. Consumers could not afford the higher prices and used their higher wages to help reduce debts while higher wages meant employers were unlikely to recruit more workers. Thus the record of the New Deal can be seen as more mixed than was first thought.

(b) How far do you agree that President Hoover's response to the Great Crash was wholly inadequate? [20]

In response to the Great Crash, Hoover introduced a series of policies, most of which made the USA's economic position worse. Firstly, he decided to keep the USA on the gold standard, putting the USA at a competitive disadvantage compared with countries which did give up on gold. Doing so required higher interest rates, a policy which deepened the recession. Also, Hoover signed the Smoot-Hawley Bill to increase tariffs, another move which hit foreign trade – if not by as much as is sometimes portrayed. In late 1932, Hoover decided to increase taxes in order to try and restore confidence in American economic policy. All it did was further deflate the economy.

In the same year, Hoover introduced two measures to address the depression: the Reconstruction Finance Corporation gave some support to loans to private industry; the Home Loans Bank System aimed to help mortgagees. So, eventually, he let the US federal government take some action to address the onset of economic depression. However, for the most part, he remained wedded to traditional economic analysis. He rejected what he called 'dangerous' federal government action such as more direct intervention in the economy. Hoover's policies certainly did little to alleviate the worsening economic problems which the USA faced during his time as President. Whether his economic policies were wholly inadequate is a matter for continuing debate.

Section C: International Option

International Relations, 1871–1945

9 International Relations, 1871–1918

(a) Why did Bismarck establish a system of alliances? [10]

Although Germany was the most dominant power in continental Europe, both economically and militarily, Bismarck appreciated its vulnerability. Germany faced possible attack from the West (France), East (Russia) and South (Austria-Hungary). Therefore, he aimed to establish a series of friendly alliances, keep out of the race for overseas possessions and isolate potential enemies. In particular, he wanted to isolate France, which he realised might be seeking revenge for its defeat in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1. With this aim in mind, he established the Dreikaiserbund in 1873. When this had failed by 1879, he formed the Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary. This was extended to the Triple Alliance when Italy joined in 1883. Concerned about a possible hostile alliance between Russia and France, he organised the Reinsurance Treaty with Russia in 1887.

(b) How far was President Theodore Roosevelt responsible for the USA's move towards a more imperialistic foreign policy? [20]

In support of Roosevelt's responsibility, it could be argued that he firmly believed the USA should play a major role in world affairs. As President from 1901–1909, he argued that it was '*incumbent on all civilised and orderly powers to insist on the proper policing of the world*'. He ensured that the USA gained control of the building and operation of the Panama Canal, and negotiated the Treaty of Portsmouth which ended the Russo-Japanese War in 1905. He organised the Platt Amendment in 1903, which granted the USA effective control over Cuba's foreign policy. The Roosevelt Corollary of 1904 stated that the USA would intervene if any Caribbean state became threatened by internal or external factors. That he was not afraid to use this new power was clear – in 1905, the USA occupied the Dominican Republic; in 1909, the USA helped rebels depose the President of Nicaragua. These policies were in marked contrast to the USA's isolationist tradition. Roosevelt justified them by arguing that the USA had to protect its own economic interests and must prevent European interference in the Americas.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that the move towards a more imperialistic foreign policy was already present before Roosevelt became president. The USA's industrial expansion had been reliant on the domestic market; an economic downturn in 1893 alerted industrialists and businessmen to the need for overseas markets, which would in turn require a strong navy and overseas bases. This led to a debate between those favouring isolationism and those wanting a more expansive foreign policy. The 1898 war against Spain left the USA in effective control of Cuba, together with other former Spanish possessions (e.g. Philippines, Puerto Rico and Guam). Many politicians, such as Bryan, opposed this and wanted a return to isolationism. Bryan's defeat to McKinley in the 1900 presidential elections showed that the imperialist lobby had already won the debate before Roosevelt became president.

10 International Relations, 1919–1933

(a) Why did the French seek a harsh peace settlement with Germany? [10]

France wanted to destroy Germany both economically and militarily. France had suffered from German aggression during WWI and still resented its humiliating and costly defeat in the Franco-Prussian War (1871). The French demanded revenge but also wanted to ensure that Germany could never again threaten French borders. Clemenceau's aim at the Paris peace settlement, therefore, was to ensure that Germany paid in full for the damage it had caused by its invasion of France in WWI and was seriously weakened in the future. He argued for heavy reparations, restoration of French land taken in 1871 and major restrictions on Germany's future military capabilities. The USA (through President Wilson) wanted a fair, just and lasting peace; Britain had a vested interest in the German economy (a major consumer of British exports) being resorted quickly; Clemenceau was, therefore, at odds with his major allies. His determination to inflict a harsh settlement on the Germans earned him the nickname 'The Tiger'.

(b) 'Woodrow Wilson was the architect of the Paris Peace Settlement.' How far do you agree? [20]

In support of the view, it could be argued that Wilson had a significant influence over the outcomes of the Paris peace conference, negotiations being based on his Fourteen Points. It was at his insistence that the League of Nations was included in all of the peace treaties, allowing for negotiation of disputes and openness in treaties between nations. Wilson's belief in self-determination (that people of common nationality should have the right to form their own nations and govern themselves) led to the creation of the 'successor states'. His aim of disarmament was enshrined in the peace settlement, although only Germany was to comply. The Mandate system was designed to deal with rival colonial claims, giving local people the right to have their own desires taken into account.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that Wilson's aim of '*peace without victory*' was not achieved. The terms of the Treaty of Versailles were very harsh on Germany, largely at the insistence of France, leading to the very resentment which Wilson had been so keen to avoid (e.g. War Guilt Clause, reparations). In terms of self-determination, decisions were largely forced on the peacemakers by existing circumstances rather than based on Wilson's idealism. Wilson's desire for Russia to play a key role in ensuring future peace could not be achieved because of the revolution; indeed, American forces were providing some assistance to the counter-revolutionaries in the civil war. His dream of the League of Nations was undermined from the start by his own country's refusal to ratify the peace settlement. Wilson had little real understanding of the complex problems facing Europe. Rather than Wilson's aim of creating a fair peace which would ensure future world peace, a harsh settlement was imposed on the defeated nations.

11 International Relations, 1933–1939

(a) Why did Mussolini order the invasion of Abyssinia in 1935? [10]

By 1935, Mussolini was widely respected as a diplomat abroad, but little progress had been made towards the ambitious aims of which he had boasted when he came to power. With Italy suffering from major economic problems and Mussolini's own popularity declining, there was a clear need for a propaganda boost. Italy's attempt to colonise Abyssinia in 1896 had ended in defeat; Mussolini was determined to succeed where others had failed. The Italian colonies of Eritrea and Somalia had been under constant attack by gangs from Abyssinia, which the Abyssinian government had failed to stop. Border disputes near Walwal provided the excuse, but Mussolini had already ensured that France (wanting Italian support against Germany) would not oppose his ambitions in Abyssinia. Mussolini argued that Italy was merely following the pattern of colonisation which other countries (e.g. Britain and France) had already deployed, and that Abyssinia would provide Italy with raw materials and a market for its goods. Although both Italy and Abyssinia were members of the League of Nations, Mussolini had seen how Hitler had successfully challenged both it and the Treaty of Versailles, and now saw an aggressive foreign policy as a way of restoring support in Italy.

(b) To what extent was Franco's victory in the Spanish Civil War caused by the disunity of his enemies? [20]

In support of the view, it could be argued that the Republicans comprised various left-wing groups all having their own, often contradictory, aims. Liberals wanted a modern democracy, communists wanted a Russian-style revolution, separatists wanted independence for their regions, anarchists wanted no government at all. This disunity had been evident in 1931, when communists and anarchists opposed the socialists who controlled the Republic, arguing that their policies were not extreme enough. The only thing holding these disparate groups together was opposition to a military dictatorship.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that there were more significant reasons for Franco's victory, for example:

- Franco managed to maintain unity within the various right-wing groups which made up the Nationalists (the Church, the army, monarchists, the Falangists).
- Franco had control of the army. His troops were well trained, professional soldiers, whereas the Republicans were largely workers who lacked military organisation, discipline and equipment.
- Franco benefitted from military assistance from Italy, Germany and (to a lesser extent) Portugal. In addition to troops, this gave Franco access to planes and tanks. Air power was a crucial factor in Franco's victory.
- The Republicans were denied formal foreign assistance because of the Non-Interference policy adopted by the League of Nations. Although there were International Brigades of volunteers supporting the Republicans, these were untrained and ill-equipped.
- Britain and France were concerned about the threat of communism and saw Russia as a potential enemy. They viewed Italy as a vital ally against Russia and were reluctant to take action against its involvement in Spain. Appeasement was the order of the day.

12 China and Japan, 1919–1945

(a) Why was the Northern Expedition successful? [10]

The Northern March was a military advance by KMT forces under Chiang Kai-shek which aimed to destroy the power of warlords and create a unified China. KMT forces were far better organised than the armies of the warlords, benefitting from the help of Soviet military advisors and modern equipment from the USSR and Germany. (Stalin saw a re-unified China as a potential ally to help end the isolation of the USSR.)

Weary of the violence and chaos caused by the warlords, ordinary Chinese people welcomed and supported the KMT – peasants, factory workers, shopkeepers, businessmen, merchants could all see the benefits which a KMT victory might bring. Moreover, the KMT had the support of the CCP; this, together with the belief that the KMT would bring about social reform (as promised in Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles) encouraged peasants and factory workers to support it. The KMT army grew in numbers as the March continued – 100 000 in July 1926 to over 250 000 by December 1926. With such widespread support, the March was able to take major cities, including Peking itself in 1928.

(b) To what extent were Japan's economic problems responsible for the country becoming a military dictatorship in the 1930s? [20]

In support of the view that economic problems were responsible, it could be argued that the economic boom which Japan had experienced as a result of WWI ended by 1921, by which time European industry had revived and was beginning to recover lost markets. Unemployment rose in the major cities while farmers were hit by falling prices. Attempts by industrial workers and farmers to form political organisations were suppressed by the government. Japan was badly hit by the world economic crisis which followed the Wall Street crash – Japanese exports fell, leading to further unemployment. The government was widely blamed for these problems. A more aggressive foreign policy towards China seemed to be a way of easing Japan's economic problems – providing new sources of raw materials and a bigger market for Japanese goods.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that the idea of democracy was relatively new in Japan, the Diet having only been created in 1889. The Japanese people's respect for parliamentary democracy declined quickly when it became clear that many politicians were corrupt and open to bribery. Moreover, politicians seemed unable to reach agreement on key issues, leading to weak and ineffective government. Democracy seemed to be dividing Japan rather than unifying it. Secret military groups began to appear (e.g. Cherry Blossom Society), which aimed to end parliamentary democracy and restore the Emperor as head of state in a military dictatorship. The agreements which the Japanese government made at the Washington Conferences (1921–22) were not widely popular – public opinion was nationalistic and anti-Western, and therefore opposed agreements reached with the USA and European nations. That the democratic government had little real control was shown when the Kwantung Army took unilateral action in Manchuria; when the Prime Minister, Inukai Tsuyoshi, criticised this action, he was assassinated. The Emperor steadfastly refused to order the Kwantung Army to withdraw.