Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9489/22**

Paper 2 Outline Study **October/November 2022**

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 October/November 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© UCLES 2022

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.

© UCLES 2022

Part (a)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 4	**Connects factors to reach a reasoned conclusion** • 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)** • 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)** • 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** • 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**

© UCLES 2022

Part (b)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 5	**Responses which develop a sustained judgement** • 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** • 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** • 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	**9–12**
Level 2	**Responses which show some understanding of the question** • 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	**5–8**
Level 1	**Descriptive or partial responses** • 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**

© UCLES 2022

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**Explain why the insurrection of 10 August 1792 happened.** Indicative content • After Louis XVI's failed attempt to flee France in June 1791 support for the monarchy began to fall markedly. The attempted escape was a threat to what the revolution had so far achieved. • The outbreak of war in April 1792 increased the fear of traitors and counter-revolutionaries. The French army was weakened by unreliable officers and undisciplined recruits. Therefore, the army had to rely, more and more, on volunteers from the urban working populations. This meant the *sans culottes* demanded an increased voice in decision making. • Economic considerations further influenced their actions. The 1791 harvest had been mediocre and grain prices rose. In 1792, there was a demand to halt the free trade in grain and for prices to be fixed by law. The *sans culottes* saw rising grain prices as a counter-revolutionary design to starve them into surrender. • The Brunswick Manifesto, July 1792, added to the mix of fear and tension in Paris. It threatened the people of Paris with retribution if any harm befell the king. • This led to a growing demand for the dethronement of the king, and the Legislative Assembly (LA) agreed to debate the question on the 9 August. However, the LA's decision not to indict Lafayette, now seen as an enemy of the revolution, convinced many that there would be no decision made about dethronement. In the early hours of 10 August the sounding of the tocsin, the call to insurrection since the journées of 1789, marked the start of the seizure of power. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**'The Concordat of 1801 was Napoleon's greatest domestic achievement.' How far do you agree?** Indicative content The Concordat provided stability. Most of the French people were Catholic, and they had been appalled at the disorder in Church–State relations brought about by events since 1789. It restored the Church to a position of influence within France, albeit not at the same level as before 1789. Nonetheless, it was established that Catholicism was the religion of most French citizens and that it would be freely exercised. Those who had purchased Church lands were able to keep them, and so were supportive of Napoleon's actions. Those of a more revolutionary inclination were pleased that the Church's wealth was not restored and welcomed the toleration of other religions as a further limit to the Church's influence. Extreme ultramontanists and unreformed Jacobins might take issue, but they were a small minority. Therefore, the Concordat had a far-reaching appeal which provided extensive support for Napoleon's regime from an early stage and which could be built upon. The statement, however, can be challenged. Napoleon was able to achieve a large amount of economic stability, something that had been noticeably lacking since 1789. This was done through the founding of the Bank of France in 1800 and its direct control by the state in in 1806. This helped to establish France's creditworthiness. The introduction of a new coinage in 1803 established economic order by helping the country become solvent. The Civil Code brought rationality to the legal system by making the law accessible to all and establishing the principle of equality before the law. The system was widely accepted and still lasts. The lessening of women's rights by the Civil Code, whilst questionable by the standards of today, was seen, from an early nineteenth century standpoint, as a necessary correction of revolutionary excess. These policies gave the impression that Napoleon was ruling in the interests of all, and it was this perception, perhaps, that was his greatest domestic achievement. Candidates might seek to define 'greatest' and use its definition to organise their response. This is perfectly acceptable. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Explain why governments started to regulate working conditions.** Indicative content • Humanitarianism – inspired by Christian beliefs many MPs (Whig/Tory/Radical) saw it as their Christian duty to aid the weaker members of society. For example, the Cotton Mills and Factories Act (1819) sought to regulate the hours and conditions of work of children in the cotton industry. • Utilitarianism – based on the ideas of Jeremy Bentham, who believed it was the government's role to promote 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number'. To do this it had to protect the weak, the vulnerable and the poor. Stress was placed on the thorough investigation of an issue, precise laws, and their effective enforcement. Hence the Factory Acts of 1833 and 1844. • Moral zeal – members serving on the commissions investigating coalmines were shocked to find that women worked underground, stripped to the waist, alongside men. The 1842 Mines Act was as much about maintaining 'moral standards' as improving working conditions. • Gradual acceptance – the changes wrought by industrialisation needed government to adopt a more interventionist role and legislating on working conditions was one such area the government had to act upon, as well as regulating key industries such as railways and banks (Railway Regulation Act, 1840 and 1844 and Bank Charter Act 1844). Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**How far did mechanisation lead to the Industrial Revolution?** Indicative content The extensive increase in production, a 'revolution', would, probably, not have taken place without its use. Therefore, there is a case to be made for its central role in the Industrial Revolution. For example, seed drills, flying shuttles and steam engines were all vital for the growth in production. The use of mechanisation led, also, to a significant drop in the price of goods. This then helped in the creation of a mass market. Mechanisation's use led to the need for a large labour force which, in turn, stimulated the development of urbanisation. The need to supply raw materials in bulk to feed this increased mechanised production and then move the goods produced by the machines, led to developments in transport, such as canals and railways. The increasing import and export of goods produced a growth in ports and international trade. The primary role, however, of mechanisation can be questioned. The changes in agriculture meant that there was a plentiful supply of food to feed the growing population. This ensured that labour force was available, and its existence, and continued growth, maintained and increased the demand for manufactured goods. The development of international markets meant that demand would not be limited to the domestic market. The availability of energy sources, initially water and then coal, meant that there was the power required to drive mechanised systems. The government's *laissez-faire* approach encouraged innovation and investment. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Explain why the Frankfurt Parliament collapsed.** Indicative content • The Prussian king, Frederick-William IV, refused the imperial crown proffered by the Parliament. This meant that it did not have the substantial military and economic support of Prussia. It had no effective means to establish its ideas and policies. • The Parliament was divided. Some favoured a 'Greater Germany' with Catholic Austria maintaining its leadership, whilst others favoured a 'Little Germany' which excluded Austria in favour of the leadership of Protestant Prussia. In October 1848 it seemed the 'Greater Germany' option had won, but only Austria's German lands were to be incorporated. Austria refused to accept this break up of its lands. • It was a talking shop – the 'Parliament of Professors.' It was dominated by the middle-classes and failed to get the support of the lower-classes. It rejected the Industrial Code put forward by the Artisans' Congress in Frankfurt as it clashed with the Parliament's support of economic liberalism. Therefore, the lower classes had no faith in the Parliament. • It lacked legitimacy because it had not been initiated by the German Confederation. In April 1849, the Austrian delegates were recalled followed by the Prussians in May and then by delegates from Saxony and Hanover. The Frankfurt Parliament became a rump rather than a national assembly. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	**To what extent was German unification the result of Bismarck's actions?** Indicative content Bismarck felt that this certainly was the case. In his memoirs, written in the 1890s, he presented himself as a statesman whose foresaw all events, and this enabled him to achieve his goals. In 1862, shortly before coming to power, he told the British politician, and future Prime Minister, Benjamin Disraeli that he intended to deal with Denmark, Austria, and France in order to unite Germany under Prussian leadership. By 1871, Bismarck had achieved his primary goals. Berlin not Vienna was the capital of German affairs, Austria's dominant role in German affairs was no more and the position of the Prussian king was transformed as he held the title Emperor, with the German states united under Prussian control. There can be no doubt that Bismarck was a most astute politician. He broke the impasse with liberals in the Prussian Parliament over military reforms and these reforms were vital in supplying the victories of 1864, 1866 and 1870–71. Bismarck's handling of the intricacies of the Schleswig-Holstein dispute (regarding Denmark and then Austria) and the Ems telegram appeared to show what an arch-manipulator he was, seemingly the puppet-master who controlled affairs. However, there were other factors which led to German unification. Whilst acknowledging that Bismarck had broad aims, this does not mean he mapped out specific moves. The French responded to the Ems telegram as they did because they felt war would achieve their aims and they were confident of victory. In essence, he can be seen as a Prussian patriot rather than a German nationalist, and his loyalty lay with the Prussian king not the German people. Bismarck benefited from a fortuitous international situation. In 1862, Prussia was seen as a second-rate power in Europe. Thus, Prussia was able to enhance its position without arousing the hostility of its neighbours. Britain saw a strong Germany as a bulwark against France and Russia. German unification can be seen as the result of the wars of 1864, 1866 and 1870–71. Therefore. It was the fighting capacity of the army and the leadership of its generals which made this happen. The economic growth of the 1850s and 1860s meant Prussia was producing more steel and coal than France and Austria and had a more extensive railway network. This economic strength provided the financial means to supply the Prussian army with the military resources to challenge, successfully, Austria and France. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	**Explain why there was a battle at Fort Sumter in 1861.** Indicative content The Battle of Fort Sumter was the first battle of the American Civil War and signalled the start of the war. It took place over two days from April 12–13, 1861. The fort was commanded by Major Robert Anderson of the Northern army. • Fort Sumter sat on an artificial island near Charleston in South Carolina. It held no strategic value but it was a symbol of Northern power in the region. After the secession of South Carolina in December 1860 Gov. Francis Pickens sent commissioners to Washington, D.C., to claim possession of the forts in Charleston Harbor and all other U.S. property in his state. • The situation surrounding the fort had grown increasingly tense as South Carolina had seceded from the Union and the Confederacy was established. The leader of the Confederate Army, General P.T. Beauregard, began building up his forces around the fort in Charleston Harbor. • Major Anderson and his troops soon began to run out of food and supplies on the isolated island. However, even though they were surrounded by the Confederate army his troops refused to leave. • On April 12, 1861 General Beauregard sent Major Anderson a message saying that he would fire in one hour if Anderson didn't surrender. Anderson didn't surrender and the firing began. The South bombarded Fort Sumter from all sides. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

Question	Answer	Marks
4(b)	**'The Missouri Compromise effectively dealt with the issue of slavery throughout the period 1820–50.' How far do you agree?** Indicative content Possible discussion over the successes of the Missouri Compromise: The Missouri Compromise was successful in that it kept peace between the sections for 30 years from its adoption in 1820 to its repeal in 1850. The idea that a balance should be sought and discussed at federal level was generally accepted in this period and kept peace through a time of huge transition for the United States. The period saw the beginning of industrialisation in the North while agricultural practices were entrenched in the South. The Compromise also enabled Westward Expansion to proceed to some extent as there was an 'agreed' method of deciding the status of new territories and states. Possible discussions over the failures of the Missouri Compromise: • The major challenges to the Missouri Compromise appeared throughout the 1840s and it is possible to argue that it was just not effective in facing these. The huge land acquisition brought about by the inclusion of Texas into the union and the following treaty gains after the Mexican American war meant that the fragile balance could not be maintained. • Westward Expansion – the growth of the country Westwards (especially after 1840) became an increasing challenge to the Missouri Compromise as questions over the entrance of states to the union was posed. The 36°30' 'Dixie' line became unworkable as people, goods and slaves were taken west. This was particularly problematic in the far west in places like California which saw huge population explosions. • Wider issues following the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo – the treaty which followed the Mexican American War signed in 1848 offered particular challenges to the Missouri Compromise. The inclusion of large swathes of land in the South West of the country worried many Northerners because the territories technically fell under the Missouri Compromise and could thus become slave states. Northerners in Congress argued that these new territories should not be subject to the Compromise whereas Southerners argued vigorously that slavery should be allowed. These discussions effectively saw the destruction of the Missouri Compromise and the renewed agreement of 1850. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

Question	Answer	Marks
5(a)	**Explain why political machines and party bosses in the big cities were criticised by Progressives.** Indicative content • One of the best known party machines was Boss Tweed's organisation known as Tammany Hall, after the headquarters of a charity, St. Tammany. Tammany Hall politics meant the control of city government by a small group of individuals who conspired to their own material benefit by gaining control of key departments and the money they spent. • It also meant control of local elections as Tammany Hall politicians controlled the registration of electors and the conduct of elections. Thus, they could be sure that grateful voters would elect their friends, knowing that they would issue contracts which benefited both Tammany members, also known as the Tweed Ring, as well as their voters. • Party machines, and the Bosses that went with them, were unpopular with progressive reformers in particular because they abused both the electoral process and the conduct of city government mainly in their own self-interest. • However, there were other reasons that people disliked these machines – one of which was their support of immigrant groups. Tammany Hall defended Irish Catholics against State Militiamen when an Orange march was proposed in the city. They also included other European immigrant populations over time, embracing Germans, Jews, Italians, Poles, and others as they arrived, and later recruiting members of those groups to run for office. Although progressive-minded reformers saw this as using an 'uneducated' population; nativist groups also disliked some activities of the party machines. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

Question	Answer	Marks
5(b)	**To what extent did the rapid economic growth in the late nineteenth century benefit Americans?** Indicative content Candidates will consider the benefits and problems caused by rapid economic growth. This discussion can be had by considering different groups of Americans and what the impact was on each group. Possible discussion of the benefits of rapid industrialisation: • Candidates may argue that one positive of rapid industrialisation was the increased organisation of workers – for example, American Federation of Labour, 1881. Various examples can be found of labour unrest resulting in conflict with the authorities but also some change in practices, i.e. Molly Maguires in Pennsylvania, 1874, Haymarket Affair, Chicago, 1886. • Candidates may also argue that the increased employment opportunities brought by rapid industrialisation ultimately benefited millions of workers including those arriving from overseas. The growth of the economy which was tied up with the Second Industrial Revolution made the United States rich and benefited all her citizens. Possible discussion of problems caused by rapid industrialisation: • Rapid industrialisation meant rapid urbanisation as more workers were needed to work the machines. Many of these workers were immigrants, from Europe mainly and from Asia. Many of the industrial cities lacked the facilities and infrastructure necessary to provide for the 'huddled masses' crowded around the factories. • Cities such as New York and Chicago grew rapidly. In the thirty years from 1870 to 1900, Chicago grew from 300 000 to 1.7 million. Growth on this scale put immense pressure on conditions in the city. Workers crowded into tenements close to their workplace, which lacked running water and thus were insanitary. Drunken and disorderly conduct counted for half of the 60 000 arrests in New York in 1889. • Economic depressions, for example, 1873 and 1893, did not help matters. These factors led to social instability if not effectively managed. 'Social instability' is best illustrated by strikes and demonstrations against living and working conditions, for example, long working hours. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

Question	Answer	Marks
6(a)	**Explain why Hoover's response to the Great Crash was ineffective.** Indicative content • The Great Crash occurred just seven months after Hoover became president, a point which is sometimes overlooked. Hoover initially thought that the Crash was a compensating mechanism after the irrational exuberance of the markets in the previous few years. It should also be noted that this was not an uncommon economic opinion at the time. So, in many ways Hoover was unprepared both personally and political for a crisis as significant as the Great Crash. • Hoover attempted to respond to the first stage of the Crash by encouraging states and private companies to start investment projects, especially road building. The federal government which Hoover controlled could do little as it had such a limited economic role at the time. • As the Crash worsened in late 1930 and then again in 1931, Hoover came to face an economic crisis greater than had been seen before. Thus one reason why Hoover's response was so ineffective was the depth of the depression he faced. Another was the international dimension the crisis had developed by 1931 with the UK going off the gold standard. Hoover was actually quite unorthodox in his response to the Crash in 1931–32 but by then the Crash had too strong a hold. Had he been less orthodox at the start of the crisis, his actions might have been more effective. Thus intellectual orthodoxy was another reason for his ineffective response. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

Question	Answer	Marks
6(b)	**'Opposition to the New Deal had little impact on the policies pursued by Roosevelt.' How far do you agree?** Indicative Content: Possible discussion on weaknesses of New Deal opponents: • The political opponent of the New Deal which would have the greatest effect on FDR's reforms was the Republican Party in Congress. Not only were the numbers against the Republicans being effective in opposition, but the Republican Party itself was divided between Eastern conservatives and Western progressives. They took quite different attitudes towards New Deal reforms. In addition, the Republicans were the minority party for the first time in a long time – the First World War apart – which took much getting used to. Finally, they were seen as the party in charge when the Great Depression occurred and so blamed by many for the situation the country found itself in. The Republican approach seemed no answer to a depression of unprecedented depth. • Instead, many focus on opposition outside of Republican opposition. The two best known are Huey Long and Charles Coughlin. Huey Long was a Democratic Senator, Charles Coughlin a Roman Catholic priest. Both, after initially supporting the New Deal, turned against it for being too cautious and ineffective. Both used the new medium of the radio to gain support. Before his assassination, Huey Long became more left-wing. Father Coughlin's views moved more towards the right. Both gained a great public response, but it never turned into organised and effective electoral opposition to a President and a party which gained more support in 1936. • Thus, the disarray, intellectual and organisational, of the opposition allied with the more energetic efforts of the Roosevelt administration meant that political opposition had little impact on the Roosevelt and his New Deal policies. Possible discussion of success of New Deal opposition: • Judicial opposition – Perhaps the opposition which had the greatest impact on policy came from the Supreme Court. The Schechter Poultry Corporation vs. United States [1935], in which a unanimous Supreme Court made a judgement which undermined the National Industrial Recovery Act of 1933, a crucial New Deal reform, and US vs. Butler [1936], which negated the Agricultural Adjustment Act are both key examples here. • Second New Deal – It is possible to argue that the opposition which Roosevelt faced from the left after 1933 did change his policies as he moved towards the Second New Deal and re-election.	**20**

Question	Answer	Marks
6(b)	• Speaking in 1935 Roosevelt himself said, '*I am fighting Communism, Huey Longism, Coughlinism and Townsendism*'. In 1936, these three movements came together to form the Union Party to contest the presidential election. It gained less than one million votes. It is argued, however, that the threat posed by these groups to Roosevelt was such that he adapted his policies to address some of their demands, the clearest example being his plans for a Wealth Tax. Those plans did not come to much after the election, however. Some commentators go further, arguing that most of the Second New Deal was a response to these mass movements, for example, Social Security was first proposed by Francis Townsend. Accept any other valid responses.	

Question	Answer	Marks
7(a)	**Explain why Wilhelm II, sent the Kruger Telegram in 1896.** Indicative content On New Years' Day 1896 the Jameson raid was launched by the British into Transvaal on the excuse of helping British miners (uitlanders) who were being discriminated against by Kruger's Government. It was meant to trigger an Uitlander uprising but this failed to materialise and the raid failed. • The telegram was to congratulate Kruger on repelling the Raid. • The telegram was interpreted in the Transvaal as a sign of possible German support in the future. • William's intention was to demonstrate to the British that they were diplomatically isolated. • Wilhelm wanted to win 'a place in the sun' and hoped for British support in this • It was an attempt to encourage Britain to become more friendly with Germany. This proved to be a diplomatic and psychological blunder. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

Question	Answer	Marks
7(b)	'**Up to 1917 the USA consistently avoided involvement in the affairs of European nations.' How far do you agree with this statement?** Indicative content This is a question with clear alternatives from which a balanced judgement can be made. In support of the claim: The US had, from the time of the Monroe Doctrine, isolated itself from European affairs. Even following the acquisition of the remnants of the Spanish Empire the US focused on developing its Pacific, avoiding involvement in European affairs. Given that many of its citizens came from different European countries and many had migrated to avoid persecution and escape poverty there was little appetite amongst many Americans for involvement with the other world powers. When the First World War began the US immediately asserted its neutrality and President Wilson was strongly opposed to involvement. Wilson fought the 1916 election campaign on a platform of continuing neutrality and won a second term. Challenging the claim: The Progressive presidents from McKinley onwards pursued a more active overseas policy and engaged in international negotiations like the Treaty of Portsmouth (Russo-Japanese War). Roosevelt built up a modern navy and sent it on an international tour to enhance US prestige in 1907–09 (the Great White Fleet). The US increasingly got involved in situations when its growing international interest were threatened (e.g. Boxer Rising). US banks made large loans to Britain and France that were used to buy US manufactured equipment in the early years of the war and the actions of German submarines turned popular opinion increasingly against Germany with Wilson only narrowly winning the 1916 election; the Zimmermann Telegram was just the last straw. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

Question	Answer	Marks
8(a)	**Explain why the Treaty of Sevres led to conflict in Turkey.** Indicative content It was far more severe than the treatment of Germany: • It involved handing over much of the Middle East to Britain and France as League of Nation Mandates and the division of Turkey itself into areas of influence for the victorious powers. • it included taking much of eastern Turkey to create an independent Armenian state • this aroused anger and a rise in nationalist agitation • It caused civil war between the Sultan's government in Istanbul and the breakaway Turkish Grand National Assembly which was formed by Mustafa Kemal in Ankara. • There were protests against British and French rule in the mandated territories. • In 1922 the Sultanate was abolished and replaced by a republican government. • As a result the Treaty was never formally ratified and was replaced in 1922 by the Treaty of Lausanne. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

Question	Answer	Marks
8(b)	**To what extent had Germany regained its position as a major power by 1929?** Indicative content The answer offers possibilities for a balanced consideration of Germany's re-emergence from the humiliation of Versailles and economic collapse. Arguments for recovery: Candidates might consider the growing involvement of Germany in international negotiations. Despite the failure of the Genoa Conference the Rapallo Pact with Russia was agreed. More significant recovery stemmed from the Dawes Plan of 1924 which restored some stability to Germany's economic position and allowed its economy to begin growing again. And Anglo–German trade negotiations led to a trade treaty in 1925. The Locarno Pact marked a big step forward and the 'Spirit of Locarno' which characterised international relations in the latter part of the 1920s marked German re-admission to the international community, as exemplified by its admission to the League of Nations in 1926. Germany was also a signatory of the Kellogg-Briand Pact and saw its reparations commitment stabilised by the Young Plan which demonstrated Germany's improved international position by the end of the 1920s. Arguments against acceptance: The Ruhr invasion exemplified French mistrust of Germany which had been heightened by the Rapallo Pact. Despite improved relations in Briand/Stresemann era this remained. The Locarno agreement eased relations on Germany's western border but there was no similar improvement on its eastern border and Poland in particular was very critical of Locarno. The harsh terms of the Treaty of Versailles remained in place, its colonies were gone and its armed forces restricted to such a level that it could probably not even defend itself if attacked. Despite the promise of Versailles, no other country showed any sign of disarming and, despite Kellogg-Briand pact there were no active talks on arms reduction. Germans still felt aggrieved and unfairly treated and the Wall Street Crash gave extremists the opportunity to capitalise on this perceived inequality. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**

Question	Answer	Marks
9(a)	**Explain why Danzig was an important factor in the worsening of German–Polish relations in the late 1930s.** Indicative content The issue of Danzig stems from the Versailles settlement of the issue of Polish access to the sea at the expense of the continuity of German territory between East and West Prussia. • At the end of the First World War Danzig was made a free city under the protection of the League of Nations and linked in a customs union to Poland. However, its population remained predominantly German. • By 1936 the city council was dominated by Nazis and demands for re-union with Germany were increasing. • The Poles had built a new port at Gdynia which, by the 1930s, was handling more trade that Danzig which increased resentment in Danzig. • Hitler's aim of re-uniting all German people increased tensions especially after the Sudeten Crisis. • Hitler's repudiation of the German Polish Treaty in March 1939 heighted fear of his intentions regarding Danzig in particular and Poland in general. Raised fears that Danzig would be an excuse for invasion just as the Sudetenland had been. • The League, as guarantor of the city's independence, had lost all credibility by 1939. Accept any other valid responses.	**10**

Question	Answer	Marks
9(b)	**How far did the Japanese takeover of Manchuria undermine the credibility of the League of Nations?** Indicative content Answers should focus on the issue of the credibility of the League as an international force for peace. The Japanese takeover did undermine the League: The Japanese ignored all League Council's resolution calling for their withdrawal and when a special session of the Assembly repeated this call the Japanese simply withdrew, never to return (Feb 1933). The league failed to impose economic sanctions which had an adverse effect on later actions re. Abyssinia and the Spanish Civil War. Later in 1933 when Germany failed to get what it wanted from the League sponsored World Disarmament Conference, Hitler used it as an excuse to also leave the League. As a result of these Mussolini felt confident to challenge the Leagues authority in his invasion of Abyssinia leaving the League when it tried to take action against him. As a result, the League was increasingly ignored in international crises. The Japanese takeover did not undermine the League/ It was other factors: The League followed established arbitration procedures, setting up the Lytton commission to investigate the rival claims of the Chinese and Japanese. The League had never had a military capacity to enforce its recommendations, and the British and French were not prepared to take further r actions because of a possible threat to their own far East territories so Great Power self-interest over-rode League interests as it had tended to do before, e.g. Corfu, disarmament talks, etc. Despite a positive response to Haile Selassie's appeal for help against Italy the League basically failed again to take effective action as it had failed against Italy in Corfu. The USSR was still determined to join and was admitted in 1934. Britain and France continued to give significant support to the League and its activities in other spheres continued to develop, e.g. International Drugs Convention 1936 is still active today. Accept any other valid responses.	**20**