
HISTORY

9389/02

Paper 2

For Examination from 2015

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 30 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

This document consists of **14** printed pages.

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****Indicative content****1 France, 1789–1804****(a) Explain the aims of the revolutionaries in France in 1789. [10]**

The key issue is the aims of the revolutionaries in France in 1789. Candidates might explain the economic grievances especially about the fiscal system. Its imbalance and inefficiency meant that the heaviest burdens were on the Third Estate, notably the peasantry and middle classes. The nobility and Church were mostly (but not completely) exempt from levies. The King and his supporters were accused of being wasteful. The First and Second Estates also obstructed reforms that some ministers tried to introduce. There were political grievances that the Third Estate and many in the Second Estate expressed. They opposed autocracy (but were not democrats). In 1789, the voting system in the Estates General proved controversial.

(b) How important was Louis XVI personally for the rise of Robespierre and the Jacobins? [20]

The key issue is the relative importance of factors in the rise of the Jacobins. Louis XVI was well-intentioned but ineffective as a ruler. He reacted badly to the events of 1789 and was reluctant to concede reforms such as the August Decrees and Declaration of Rights. He did not approve of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. He continued to be influenced by Marie Antoinette and other hard-line royalists inside and outside France. Suspicions that he was intriguing with foreign monarchies to suppress the revolution seemed confirmed by the Flight to Varennes (1791). His role can be compared with other factors that led to radicalism. The economic situation worsened after 1789. Food supplies deteriorated while the Treasury suffered because the fiscal system almost broke down. War proved expensive and at first unsuccessful. There were reactionary risings in some provinces such as the Vendée. The Jacobins were better organised than other revolutionary groups. They had an alliance with the sans-culottes. Robespierre offered clear, if extreme, remedies. Changing his earlier opposition to war with foreign countries, he promised to harness forces to defend the revolution. His extremism was more effective than the comparatively moderate policies of the Girondins. Terror was used widely against real and suspected enemies of the revolution. Former colleagues were executed. The Committee of Public Safety was the agency that Robespierre and the Jacobins controlled and which gave them control over France.

2 The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–1850**(a) Why was urbanisation linked to the Industrial Revolution in any two countries? [10]**

The key issue is the importance of urbanisation in the Industrial Revolution. The growth of towns provided a larger market for commodities. Towns allowed for a bigger employment pool for factories and eased the problem of unemployment in rural areas. A large, mainly unskilled labour force was available. Factories were more efficient than the small cottage industries of the pre-industrial age. Large machines were necessary for industrial growth. Other industrial trades became important, such as building. Towns became centres of communication and encouraged the building of railways. Capital investment was encouraged in towns and the growing industrial middle classes benefited as well as those who benefited

indirectly, e.g. lawyers. Britain first, then France and Germany showed the effects of urbanisation and the Industrial Revolution.

- (b) Which was more important to the Industrial Revolution in any two countries: railways or capitalism?** [20]

The key issue is the comparative importance of railways and capitalism to the Industrial Revolution. Railways created links between industrial centres, between suppliers, producers and markets. They did so much more efficiently and ultimately more cheaply than roads and canals. They created opportunities for other industries such as steel and coal. They promoted engineering works. Railways led to a concentration of industries. Industrial towns grew which provided a stimulus for other industries and forms of employment whilst the railways themselves were massive employers. Established towns and cities such as London and Paris benefited while new towns such as Swindon, Crewe and Le Mans appeared. Railways broke down regionalism which was significant in Britain and even more important in France and Germany. Capitalism was important to provide investment. Individuals were important at first but quickly banks and companies became predominant because they could provide the large amounts of funds that were necessary. Candidates might argue that capitalism made railways possible. There was a close and evident link between the availability of capital investment and industrialisation. Countries, and regions within countries, where capital was less available became less industrialised. Governments might encourage industrialisation but the general feeling of laissez-faire discouraged government investment which would come from taxes.

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

- (a) Why did Austria feel threatened by developments in the Balkans?** [10]

The key issue is the threat to Austria in the Balkans. The Balkans exposed the worst weaknesses of the Austrian empire. It was governed and administered inefficiently and had to concede rights to its provinces, which led to weakness in the face of the ambitions of other Balkan countries such as Serbia and Macedonia. The Balkan states were small individually but together caused instability. They contained racial groups that had more in common with each other than with German-based Austria. There were religious differences. Slav nationalism was a particular problem. The Balkan wars (1912–1913) resulted in gains for Serbia that alarmed Austria. There was support for a greater Serbia. Russia was a great-power rival to Austria and its friendship towards Balkan countries and peoples represented a major threat to Austria.

- (b) How far do you agree that Germany's reasons for going to war in 1914 were more defensive than aggressive?** [20]

The key issue is the reasons why Germany went to war in 1914. The case for a defensive Germany might include Germany's fear of being encircled by Russia to the east and France to the west. The Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria and Italy (1882) seemed weaker than the Triple Entente of Britain, France and Russia (developed 1884–1907). Italy was not a reliable partner while Austria was a declining power. Britain was dominant at sea. France was strengthening its army at the beginning of the twentieth century and might be seeking revenge for the defeat of 1870. Russia was also investing much in modernising its army and navy after the war with Japan. Russia had an advantage in manpower. William II's *Weltpolitik* achieved very little. Britain was the only world power in Europe. For Germany, war might well mean fighting on two fronts in Europe and at sea against a superior British navy. The Naval Race might be seen as either defensive or aggressive. The case for an aggressive Germany

might include the Schlieffen Plan, a strategy for first strike against France that involved the invasion of Belgium, whose independence and neutrality had been guaranteed by Britain and other countries. Germany – in spite of its protests to the contrary – urged Austria to take strong action against Serbia although it had few interests in the Balkans. In Germany, Kaiser's statements were warlike and the military caste was influential.

4 The Russian Revolution, 1905–1917

(a) Why was there a revolution in Russia in 1905?

[10]

The key issue is the causes of the Russian revolution in 1905. By 1905, many sections of the Russian population were dissatisfied with the rule of Nicholas II. Witte's policies benefited a few but resulted in heavier burdens on an already suffering peasantry. This led to widespread riots before 1905 which were a sign of greater resistance to come. Racial groups were dissatisfied with the Tsar's policies of russification. The war with Japan (1904–1905) was a disaster in military and political terms. Bloody Sunday was the immediate issue that sparked the revolution in 1905. Father Gapon's march revealed political demands that were unacceptable. It was suppressed by the military and Nicholas II was blamed, although he was not directly guilty. The revolution spread socially to the middle classes, geographically to many regions and ominously to the military with the Potemkin incident.

(b) Assess the claim that the most important reason for the success of the Bolsheviks in 1917 was the mistakes of the Provisional Government.

[20]

The key issue is the reasons for the success of the Bolsheviks in 1917. Candidates can provide short and long-term reasons for the success of the Bolsheviks but if taking the second approach the focus should be on 1917. Kerensky and the Provisional Government failed to deliver on some important promises but candidates can discuss whether these were mistakes or whether they were forced on the Government. For example, there were no elections for a Constituent Assembly but it was difficult to organise these when Russia was turbulent. A more clear-cut failure was the decision to continue the war. The Government was weakened by internal divisions and by the strength of the competing soviets. The economy worsened. Lenin led the Bolsheviks in a more determined manner. He recovered from the setback of the July Days and made a crucial alliance with the soviets. The Kornilov affair was another blow to the Provisional Government and was advantageous to the Bolsheviks. Lenin promised to settle the problems of land, peace and bread. The contrast between the personal leadership of Lenin and Kerensky can be seen in the events of October when Lenin asserted his personal decisiveness to overcome the doubts of other Bolsheviks to carry out another revolution – more a coup d'état.

Section B: American Option

The History of the USA, 1840–1941

Indicative content

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

- (a) Why was the USA able to expand its power in North America from the 1840s to the 1890s? [10]

The USA expanded very rapidly in this half century. The main reasons it was able to do so were its strength and the relative weakness of other powers occupying the western half of North America. These powers included Mexico to the south west, the UK to the north west, Native Americans throughout the area and, in Alaska, Russia. Their weaknesses varied from one to the other. Mexico was divided and poorly equipped, the UK was unwilling to risk another war with the USA, the Native Americans were fragmented and ill-equipped and Russia occupied elsewhere. By comparison, the USA was [largely] united, despite the civil war, and well equipped in terms of the technologies of both warfare and communications, such as the telegraph and the railway. It also had an apparently endless line of immigrants willing to 'go west' and settle the newly occupied lands. Finally, it had governments willing to lead expansion, as with the purchase of Alaska in 1867.

- (b) How far did American power in Central and South America increase between the 1840s and the 1930s? [20]

As the ex-colonies of Spain and Portugal established their political independence in the 1820s, the USA ring-fenced the Americas from European intervention with the Monroe Doctrine of 1823. In the 1840s the USA went to war with Mexico, which increased its power close to home, but across Central America, US power was limited. In South America it was even more limited. With the growth of its industrial power in the Gilded Age, the USA began to export goods and finance to the continent, thus gaining power. This was emphasised and reinforced by the 1898 war with Spain, which led to US control of Puerto Rico and *de facto* control of Cuba. In 1904, Theodore Roosevelt introduced the Roosevelt Corollary [to the Monroe Doctrine], asserting the right of the USA to intervene across the continent to maintain peace and order. The Panama Canal, long desired by the USA, was built. While Taft used dollar diplomacy to strengthen US power in Central America, Wilson used the marine corps to intervene on a greater scale in states such as Honduras and the Dominican Republic. In the 1920s, the Republican Presidents tended to swap military intervention for financial and political support. Throughout the period, the USA focused much more on Central America than on the more remote states of South America.

6 Civil War and reconstruction, 1861–1877

- (a) Explain why the Civil War lasted for four years. [10]

When the Civil War began in April 1861, two years was probably the longest it was expected to last. The war lasted much longer because the North would never accept a Southern secession from the USA, while the South had to suffer a total defeat before it would admit that its attempts to break away had failed. The prolongation of the war was also helped by the failure of either side to gain a clear military advantage in the early stages of the war. The North had the superior resources, in terms of both population and war *materiel*, and yet it

lacked the military leadership to drive home the advantage. The South lacked the resources to win the war but refused to accept defeat until Northern forces had occupied and controlled much of the South.

(b) How far did the position of ex-slaves improve by 1877?

[20]

The slaves of the South gained their legal freedom in 1865 with the Thirteenth Amendment to the constitution. They did not become US citizens until the Fourteenth Amendment was passed over two years later in 1868 and did not have a constitutional right to vote until February 1870. In gaining their personal freedom, the ex-slaves became independent of the slave owners and thus had to fend for themselves. Many ended up as sharecroppers, often working for their ex-master. Lincoln introduced the Freedmen's Bureau as a temporary measure to provide ex-slaves with education and legal support to help them build their new lives. In order to limit the freedoms of the ex-slaves, and their legal rights in particular, many state governments in the South passed the Black Codes. The Radical Republicans in Congress tried to help the blacks by passing three Civil Rights Acts during this time while military rule was introduced in order to help uphold them. The whites in the South began to organise themselves into groups such as the Ku Klux Klan and the White League, which intimidated blacks and Republicans. In 1877, following the controversial 1876 presidential election, a deal was done between the two national parties which allowed the Democrats to rule the South unimpeded by federal interventions. The formal position of the ex-slaves had improved. Their position in Southern society had changed only a little.

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

(a) Account for the rapid industrialisation of the USA in the late nineteenth century.

[10]


The US economy grew at a phenomenal rate in late nineteenth century, driven largely by the rapid growth of US manufacturing industry in what some historians call 'the second Industrial Revolution'. On the supply side, new products such as electrical goods and new services such as the railroads were being provided. At the same time, a plentiful supply of cheap – because largely immigrant – labour produced the goods at rates which made a profit for the manufacturers. On the demand side, the expanding population of the USA provided a large market for the new goods and services while foreign markets were also being opened up. The improving transport infrastructure ensured that efficient local firms gained access to the national market. In addition, the government provided high tariffs to protect US industry. Finally, entrepreneurs could raise sufficient capital to invest in the new technologies.

(b) How successful a political leader was Theodore Roosevelt?

[20]

Theodore Roosevelt was US president from 1899 to 1909, making him the leader of the Republican Party as well as the USA. In 1912 he left the Republican Party and formed the Progressive party, soon known as the Bull Moose Party. He contested the presidency that year, split the progressive vote, thus allowing Woodrow Wilson, the Democratic candidate, into office. The main focus of his political leadership was as president. He took over from McKinley following his assassination and implemented progressive domestic policies he labelled the Square Deal. This involved trust-busting initiatives and regulation of both the railroad companies and the sale of food and drugs. He also led the way in terms of conservation, establishing national parks and preserving national monuments. As a result, he comfortably won the 1904 presidential election. Having said he would not run for a third term, Roosevelt supported the election of his colleague and friend, William Taft, in 1908, but then fell out with him, setting up the Progressive party as a result. In terms of foreign policy when president, Roosevelt combined activism – the Roosevelt Corollary, building the Panama

Canal – with peace negotiating, as with the Russo-Japanese war and the financial crisis of 1906. He certainly increased US involvement in international affairs and Theodore Roosevelt is seen as one of the great American presidents, innovative, energetic and effective while in office.



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

(a) Why did the Great Crash have such a significant impact on the USA? [10]

The crash in share prices in October 1929 led to the Great Depression of the 1930s because structural flaws in the US and international economies were made worse by inappropriate government perception and actions. The flaws in the US economy focused on an over-reliance on debt to generate demand for the goods produced by US industry. The international problems were based on the USA's position as the world's leading creditor nation and also leading exporter. It lent money to other countries in order to help them buy US goods. Following the crash within the USA, the USA called in loans from countries such as Germany, which reduced demand for US goods. In addition, the Hoover administration misjudged the scale of the crisis, assuming it was one of the occasional adjustments in the economy which had happened in the past. Government policies such as the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, which increased tariffs on imports to the USA, only further reduced demand, making the crisis worse.

(b) How successfully did President Roosevelt deal with the consequences of the Great Crash between 1933 and 1938? [20]

In contrast to Hoover, Roosevelt was very activist and interventionist in dealing with the consequences of the Great Crash. From the start, he took more dramatic action, temporary closure of the banks and the 100 Days being the most obvious examples. His First New Deal, from 1933 to 1935, focused mainly on relief and recovery. His administration was very active on a range of fronts, from subsidising the farmers through the Agricultural Adjustment Act to providing electricity for poorer regions, as with the Tennessee Valley Authority. By 1935, however, his policies were having little effect on the US economy. They also created opposition from both sides of the political spectrum as well as the Supreme Court. Roosevelt decided on further reforms which are usually known as the Second New Deal. These addressed more fundamental issues, such as Social Security for the old, the regulation of the banks and workers' rights. However, they also aroused much opposition, which limited their effectiveness. The 'Roosevelt Recession' of 1937–1938 showed the limitations of FDR's economic policies. Persuaded by his advisers of the need to balance the budget, in 1937 FDR agreed to reduce government spending. In October 1933, unemployment was 22.9 per cent. In January 1938, 17.4 per cent of US workers were unemployed.

Section C: International Option

International Relations, 1871–1945

Indicative content

9 International Relations, 1871–1918

(a) Why did European nations engage in a ‘scramble for Africa’ during the late nineteenth century? [10]

In 1875, one-tenth of Africa was ruled by European countries. By 1895, this had risen to nine-tenths. In 1885, European nations signed the Treaty of Berlin, which effectively laid down rules by which the ‘scramble’ was to be conducted. Possible explanations for the ‘scramble for Africa’ might include:

- Industrial revolutions in European nations led to rapid increase in production and profits – businessmen needed new places to sell their goods and invest their money. Industrialists were also keen to find new sources of raw materials. Products of the Industrial Revolution were also influential; steamships and railways had speeded up travel and heavy artillery and machine guns made European victory against Africans almost certain.
- The Congress of Berlin (1878) had settled the map of Europe and only war could change it. Nations were forced to look elsewhere to add to their possessions.
- Africa was weak and undefended – war against spear-throwing tribesmen was viewed as better than full-blown conflict with European neighbours – Bismarck referred to war against Africans as ‘*sporting wars*’. More was now known about the ‘dark continent’ as a result of the work of explorers such as Stanley and Livingstone.
- Some parts of Africa were seen as vital for guarding existing trade routes, e.g. Britain originally took control of Egypt to guard her trade route with the Far East.
- Prestige – European nations felt it was essential to have colonies in order to maintain prestige/status with other European nations, e.g. Germany’s East African colonies cost her more than they were worth.
- Individuals may have had their own motives such as missionaries wanting to bring Christianity to Africans, administrators wanting to serve their country and bring order to the ‘natives’, those looking for adventure and those who desired influence and power, e.g. Rhodes.

(b) To what extent had the USA become an imperial power by 1914? [20]

In support of the view that the USA had become an imperial power by 1914, it could be argued that by the late nineteenth century, many South and Central Americans viewed the Monroe Doctrine as a smokescreen for a new kind of colonialism directed from the USA. Many Americans began to argue for a more expansionist foreign policy. By 1890, arguments between imperialists and anti-imperialists dominated the domestic debate about foreign policy. Arguments used by the ‘imperialists’ included:

- Social Darwinism – the USA needed to expand in order to avoid decline.
- Racial inequality – it was the USA’s duty to expand in order to bring civilisation to others.
- Economic arguments – the downturn of 1893 led many industrialists to argue that foreign markets were essential; European protectionism meant that the USA had to look elsewhere, e.g. China.

The world’s seas were seen as vital to American prosperity and security – many argued that it was essential to build a strong navy and acquire bases overseas. Examples could include the Spanish-American War of 1898. Arguments developed over Cuba and the Philippines,

long-standing Spanish colonies. The USA defeated Spain and took control of the Philippines, Puerto Rico and Guam and established a significant hold over Cuba. The USA emerged as a major Pacific power and strengthened its hold over the Caribbean region through the development of Panama Canal which was fortified by US troops.

President Roosevelt welcomed the opportunity to exploit these new possibilities. He followed policies designed to expand American influence in the Pacific and Caribbean, using fear of German intervention in the Western Hemisphere as his justification, for example:

- Platt Amendment in Cuba
- Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine stipulated that the USA would act as 'policeman' in the Caribbean (in the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua).

In challenging the view that the USA had become an imperial power by 1914, it could be argued that the Monroe Doctrine (1823) can be seen as anti-imperialist – it denied European powers access to further colonisation in the Western Hemisphere, in exchange for which the USA agreed not to interfere in European affairs. The USA's traditional attitude had always been isolationist and anti-imperialist – this was viewed as the best way to secure American interests and democracy in a world that was ruled mostly by imperialist monarchies. Anti-imperialists, headed by Democratic Presidential candidate Bryan in 1900, protested against the acquisition of overseas territories as a betrayal of the USA's traditions. American imperialism was very different from that of the Europeans – as early as 1901 a Congressional Commission recommended that the Philippines should not be formally absorbed into the USA, but granted independence after an undetermined period of time. The USA's efforts to project its naval power into the West Pacific and China provoked opposition from European nations. By 1914, the USA was a strong regional and emerging world power. The Chinese market remained elusive and profits from overseas ventures remained small and onerous. However, the USA had been able to secure its hold on the Western Hemisphere and effectively turn the Caribbean into an American lake.

10 International relations, 1919–1933

(a) Why did the Dawes Plan of 1924 lead to a reduction in international tensions? [10]

The Dawes Plan needs to be contextualised by explaining the rise in international tensions which it was seeking to address. The German economy, already devastated by WWI, was made worse by the need to pay reparations. In 1921, Germany requested permission to suspend reparation payments until her economy recovered. France refused. In 1922, the Germans claimed that they were unable to make full payments. In January 1923, France occupied the Ruhr. There is dispute regarding French motives for this, although some Anglo-American opinion saw it as an attempt by France to ensure mastery over Germany. Whatever France's motives, international tension rose considerably. French troops met passive resistance which sometimes had to be overcome with bayonets. This led to a reduction in international tension because France was now assured of at least some reparations from Germany. France agreed to withdraw her troops from the Ruhr. The powers of the French-dominated Reparations Commission were curtailed. France was no longer in a position to seek independent enforcement of German reparations payments. The German economy began to recover on the basis of American loans.

(b) To what extent did the USA pursue an isolationist foreign policy between 1919 and 1933? [20]

Arguments to suggest that the USA followed an isolationist foreign policy from 1919 to 1933 might include that the American people were tired of war and suspicious of Europe. The US Senate voted to reject both the Versailles settlement and the League of Nations. Republicans

were strongly against American involvement and commitments in foreign affairs. Until the early 1930s, the USA was ruled by Republican governments which believed in isolationism. The USA never joined the League of Nations and tried to avoid political disputes with other states and the signing of treaties, e.g. no American representative attended the Locarno Conference. When Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931, the USA condemned the action but refused to join in economic sanctions or make any move which might lead to war with Japan. As a result, Britain and France felt unable to act and the League of Nations was shown to be helpless. Throughout the 1930s, the USA remained determined not to be drawn into conflict despite the fact that acts of aggression increased.

However, in spite of her desire for isolation, the USA found it impossible to avoid some involvement in world affairs because of overseas trade, investment and the issue of European war debts and reparations. For example:

- The USA tried to increase trade and profits by investment abroad, e.g. Europe, Canada, Central and South America. The USA inevitably took an interest in what was happening in those areas, e.g. the dispute with Mexico regarding American-owned oil wells.
- Washington Conferences (1921–1922) due to US concerns at Japanese power in the Far East.
- War debts – the USA insisted that her allies repay the loans given during WWI. This led to resentment between the USA and her allies. The USA became involved in the Dawes Plan (1924) and the Young Plan (1929) which enabled Germans to pay reparations; this helped to cause the world economic crisis.
- The USA signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928.
- The USA attended a conference in London (1930). The USA, Britain and Japan reaffirmed the 5:5:3 ratio in cruisers, destroyers and submarines; this led to improved relations between the USA and Britain.

American isolationism was more concerned with keeping clear of political problems in Europe than with cutting the USA off completely from the world in general.

11 International relations, 1933–1939

(a) Why did Britain pursue a policy of appeasement towards Nazi Germany during the 1930s? [10]

Appeasement was the policy followed by Britain (and later by France) of avoiding war with aggressive powers such as Japan, Italy and Germany. Reasons why Britain appeased Nazi Germany included the desire to avoid war because:

- there was a fear of bombing of defenceless cities
- Britain was still in economic crisis and could not afford another war
- the Spanish Civil War revealed the horrors of modern warfare
- public opinion was largely pacifist
- any military action might lead to a full-scale war for which Britain was totally unprepared.

Britain felt that Germany had many genuine grievances as she had been treated too harshly at Versailles. Britain believed that if these grievances were corrected, Germany would have no need for aggression, leading to Anglo-German friendship. Since the League of Nations was helpless, Britain believed that the only way to settle disputes was by personal contact between leaders. Chamberlain thought he would be able to control and civilise Hitler. Communist Russia was seen as a bigger threat than Nazi Germany. Many British politicians were willing to ignore the unpleasant features of Nazism in the hope that Hitler's Germany would become a buffer against communist expansion westwards and many of them admired Hitler's drive and achievements.

- (b) 'Hitler never intended to cause a major war'. How far does an analysis of Hitler's foreign policy between 1933 and 1939 support this view?

Historians agree that Hitler wanted to make Germany a great power again by destroying the Versailles settlement, building up the German army, recovering lost territory (e.g. Saar and Polish Corridor) and by bringing all German-speaking peoples inside the Reich (by annexing Austria and taking territory from Czechoslovakia and Poland). Historians disagree about what Hitler planned, if anything, beyond these aims. In challenging the argument that Hitler never intended to cause a major war, it could be argued that Hitler always planned to seize the remainder of Czechoslovakia and Poland and planned to occupy Russia as far east as the Ural Mountains in order to provide '*Lebensraum*'. He consistently argued that Germany's population was too large for the area into which it was constrained. More land was needed to provide food and homes for the German people. Hitler planned to destroy communism and then develop colonies in Africa and naval bases around the Atlantic. Given that these were his aims, a major war was inevitable at some point. Evidence to support this view comes from:

- 'Mein Kampf'
- the Hossbach Memorandum, the summary of a meeting in 1937 at which Hitler explained his expansionist plans to his generals
- Hitler's 'Secret Book', which he finished in 1928 but never published
- treaties, such as the Rome-Berlin Axis and the Anti-Comintern Pact with Japan
- the fact that Hitler had a clear vision of a Europe dominated by Germany – this could only be achieved by war.

In support of the argument that Hitler never intended to cause a major war, it could be argued that Hitler expected, at most, a short war with Poland. Some historians (e.g. Taylor, Broszat) argue that Hitler's writings about '*Lebensraum*' did not amount to an actual programme which he followed step by step; it is more likely that they were a propaganda exercise to attract domestic support for the Nazi Party. Hitler was an opportunist, taking advantage of the mistakes of appeasers and of events, for example:

- the Anglo-German naval agreement 1935 – essentially, Britain was condoning German rearmament, in breach of the Versailles settlement
- sending German troops into the demilitarised zone of the Rhineland was a calculated risk; they were under orders to retreat at the first sign of resistance
- Anschluss with Austria (1938) – Britain and France did nothing but protest
- Czechoslovakia had built up her army and defences, and was hopeful that, with support from Britain and France, she could repel any German attack. The Munich Conference (1938) showed that Britain and France would do nothing to help Czechoslovakia and Hitler felt able to destroy it completely. Hitler could not have foreseen that the British and French were so inconsistent that they were prepared to support Poland (where Hitler's claim to land was more reasonable) after giving way to him over Czechoslovakia (where his case was less valid).

It is likely that, while Hitler had a clear vision of German expansionism and mastery over Europe, he had no definitive plan or timescale for its achievement. He took advantage of circumstances and almost certainly did not envisage a world war. He wanted to avoid war with Britain and wanted Britain not to interfere in his plans to defeat Poland and the USSR.

12 China and Japan, 1919–1945

(a) How was Chiang Kai-shek able to become leader of China?

Between 1916 and 1928 China disintegrated into hundreds of states controlled by warlords. The main hope for the survival of a united China lay with the Kuomintang (National People's Party) formed by Dr Sun Yat-sen in 1912 based on the three principles of nationalism, democracy and land reform. However, Kuomintang authority was largely restricted to the Canton area. Chiang Kai-shek became leader of the Kuomintang (KMT) after Sun's death in 1925. An explanation of his rise to power in China could include:

- Chiang had gained military training in Japan
- Chiang had spent time in Moscow studying the organisation of the communist party and the Red Army
- KMT benefited from help and guidance from the USSR (which hoped to forge friendship with Nationalist China).

Chiang was not a communist, his sympathies lay with businessmen and landowners and he removed left-wingers from leading positions in KMT, although he retained the useful alliance with the communists. He began the *Northern March* in 1926 with the aim of destroying the warlords of central and northern China. Hankow, Shanghai and Nanking were taken by 1927, Beijing by 1928. Reasons for Chiang's success include:

- support from communists
- local support of peasants, who were attracted by communist promises of land
- capture of Shanghai was helped by a rising of industrial workers organised by the communist member of the KMT, Zhou En-lai.

In 1927, Chiang decided that communists were becoming too powerful – they were attacking landlords and seizing land. Thus communists were expelled from KMT. In the 'purification movement', thousands of communists, trade union and peasant leaders were massacred. Some estimates put the number of deaths as high as 250,000. The communists and warlords were under control and Chiang had become military and political leader of China.

(b) To what extent was dissatisfaction with the Kuomintang the main reason for the growth in support for communism in China during the 1930s? [20]

In support of the view that the growth in support for communism was due to dissatisfaction with the KMT, it could be argued that KMT government proved to be a disappointment to the majority of Chinese people. Chiang achieved the first of Sun's principles (nationalism), but no moves were made towards democracy or land reform. There were laws intended to prevent the worst excesses of industrial working conditions, but these were ineffective because Chiang did not want to upset his industrialist supporters. The KMT supported the interests of industrialists, bankers and landowners, carried out few reforms and made no real attempt to organise mass support – Mao was able to exploit this. The KMT was seen as ineffective in dealing with the distress in rural areas caused by droughts and bad harvests – rice and wheat were hoarded in cities by profiteering merchants, while workers suffered from high taxes and forced labour.

Also the KMT put up no effective resistance to the Japanese:

- Japan occupied Manchuria in 1931 and was clearly determined to take further parts of China.
- Chiang was more concerned with fighting Mao than with fighting the Japanese, e.g. moved to Shensi to attack Mao in 1936.
- Chiang was taken prisoner by some of his own troops, incensed with KMT's lack of resistance to Japan.
- Zhou En-lai persuaded Chiang to form an alliance with the CCP to fight the Japanese. KMT forces were quickly defeated by the Japanese, but communists remained

undefeated in Shensi. Communists were thus seen as stronger than the KMT and the Japanese.

In challenging the view that the growth in support for communism was due to dissatisfaction with the KMT, it could be argued that Mao and the communists concentrated on winning mass support among the peasants, knowing that the KMT was too strong in the industrial cities. The Long March enabled Mao to establish a base in Shensi province. Mao's land policy was seen as attractive by peasants – communists seized the estates of rich landowners and redistributed them among the peasants. When communists forced a truce with KMT, they confined themselves to a less radical approach – restricting rents and ensuring that even the poorest labourers got a small piece of land – this less drastic policy won the support of smaller landowners as well as peasants. The fact that communists remained undefeated against the Japanese enabled Mao to present the CCP as patriotic nationalists, leading an effective guerrilla campaign against Japan – this gained the CCP massive support from peasants and middle classes, who hated Japanese arrogance and brutality. In 1937, the CCP had five bases controlling 12 million people. By 1945, the CCP had 19 bases controlling 100 million people.