



## Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**HISTORY**

**9489/41**

Paper 4 Depth Study

**October/November 2021**

**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 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **23** printed pages.

**Generic Marking Principles**

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

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

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

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

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

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

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

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

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

<b>AO2 – Demonstrate an understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and a substantiated judgement of key concepts: causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context, the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied.</b>		
<b><i>This mark scheme assesses the quality of analysis demonstrated in addressing the question.</i></b>		
Level 5	<p><b>Answers demonstrate a full understanding of the question, are balanced and analytical.</b></p> <p>Answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>establish valid and wide-ranging criteria for assessing the question</li> <li>are consistently analytical of the key features and characteristics of the period</li> <li>provide a focused, balanced argument with a sustained line of reasoning throughout</li> <li>reach a clear and sustained judgement.</li> </ul>	<b>13–15</b>
Level 4	<p><b>Answers demonstrate a good understanding of the question, and are mostly analytical.</b></p> <p>Answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>establish valid criteria for assessing the question</li> <li>are analytical of the key features and characteristics of the period, but treatment of points may be uneven</li> <li>attempt to provide a balanced argument, but may lack coherence and precision in some places</li> <li>reach a supported judgement, although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated.</li> </ul>	<b>10–12</b>
Level 3	<p><b>Answers demonstrate an understanding of the question and contain some analysis. Argument lacks balance.</b></p> <p>Answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>show attempts at establishing criteria for assessing the question</li> <li>show some analysis of the key features and characteristics of the period, but may also contain descriptive passages</li> <li>provide an argument but lacks balance, coherence and precision</li> <li>begin to form a judgement although with weak substantiation.</li> </ul>	<b>7–9</b>
Level 2	<p><b>Answers demonstrate some understanding of the question and are descriptive.</b></p> <p>Answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attempt to establish criteria for assessing the question but these may be implicit</li> <li>show limited analysis of the key features and characteristics of the period, and contain descriptive passages that are not always clearly related to the focus of the question</li> <li>make an attempt at proving an argument, but this is done inconsistently and/or may be unrelated to the focus of the question</li> <li>make an assertion rather than a judgement.</li> </ul>	<b>4–6</b>
Level 1	<p><b>Answers address the topic, but not the question:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focus on the topic rather than the question</li> <li>lack analysis or an argument</li> <li>lack a relevant judgement.</li> </ul>	<b>1–3</b>
Level 0	<b>No creditable content.</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>AO1 – Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately and effectively.</b>		
<b><i>This mark scheme assesses the quality and depth of knowledge deployed to support the argument made.</i></b>		
Level 5	<p><b>Answers demonstrate a high level of relevant detail.</b></p> <p>Supporting material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is carefully selected</li> <li>• is fully focused on supporting the argument</li> <li>• is wide-ranging</li> <li>• is consistently precise and accurate.</li> </ul>	<b>13–15</b>
Level 4	<p><b>Answers demonstrate a good level of relevant supporting detail.</b></p> <p>Supporting material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is selected appropriately</li> <li>• is mostly focused on supporting the argument</li> <li>• covers a range of points but the depth may be uneven</li> <li>• is mostly precise and accurate.</li> </ul>	<b>10–12</b>
Level 3	<p><b>Answers demonstrate an adequate level of supporting detail.</b></p> <p>Supporting material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is mostly appropriately selected</li> <li>• may not fully support the points being made, may be descriptive in places</li> <li>• covers a narrow range of points</li> <li>• occasionally lacks precision and accuracy in places.</li> </ul>	<b>7–9</b>
Level 2	<p><b>Answers demonstrate some relevant supporting detail.</b></p> <p>Supporting material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is presented as a narrative</li> <li>• is not directly linked to the argument</li> <li>• is limited in range and depth</li> <li>• frequently lacks precision and accuracy.</li> </ul>	<b>4–6</b>
Level 1	<p><b>Answers demonstrate limited knowledge of the topic.</b></p> <p>Supporting material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• has limited relevance to the argument</li> <li>• is inaccurate or vague.</li> </ul>	<b>1–3</b>
Level 0	<b>No creditable content.</b>	<b>0</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>Assess the extent to which the Corporate State achieved its aims.</b></p> <p>The central theory of the Corporate State was that the economy would be organised by corporations in which both employers and workers would be equally represented in a field of economic activity. Firms would remain in private hands but would be regulated by the corporations in order to ensure that production was directed in the national interest. The corporations were to be state bodies and so included state and Fascist Party officials among the membership precisely in order to ensure that the interests of the state were paramount. These self-governing corporations would bring about good labour relations, provide rational plans for production, stimulate enterprise, negotiate working conditions and pay and generally encourage the production of wealth in a setting free from traditional class conflicts between labour and management, thus avoiding strikes and other labour disputes. The corporations became consultative bodies, largely over labour issues, and not the direct managers of industrial undertakings. This dilution of syndicalist theory was inevitable, given the compromises Mussolini had to make with capitalist forces in Italy in order to build up the fascist movement. The fascist government mediated a settlement between these syndicates and the largest employers' organisation, which agreed to recognise only the fascist syndicates in future negotiations. In return, the syndicates accepted that they would exert no control in managing the factories where authority would remain in the hands of the owners. Because they had no representation within the factories, the syndicates were unable to monitor the behaviour of the employers. The fascist syndicates were denied any say in economic policy and the new system also constituted a major loss of previously hard-won workers' rights. The workers' syndicates were also deliberately fragmented and unsurprisingly these soon proved incapable of defending the interests of their members, particularly in the difficult economic conditions brought on first by the revaluation of the lira, then the onset in the early 1930s of the worldwide trade depression. The Charter of Labour, which supposedly defined workers' rights promising not only fair judgments in labour disputes, but also social reforms such as improved health and accident insurance schemes posed no threat to the employers private ownership of businesses was declared the most efficient method of running an economy, and, as for worker's rights, employers were not obliged to provide annual paid holidays, were given the power to alter working hours and night shifts without any real consultation.</p> <p>The Ministry of Economics worked throughout to limit the powers and responsibilities of the corporations and the great employers were happy to work outside the restrictions on their freedom that corporatism implied. Initiatives, reorganising or expanding major industries, usually with the aid of state money, were undertaken by the Istituto per la Ricostruzione Industriale (IRI) and without reference to the corporations.</p> <p>During the early 1930s depression, the banking system and many great manufacturing firms came under state supervision and sometimes control but this, a massive extension of the role of the state in economic matters happened outside the corporate system and through negotiations between owners and state officials.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>The state increasingly ignored the corporations in the late 1930s when the economic priority became self-sufficiency. As state contracts, subsidies and directives took on greater economic significance, so state officials preferred to deal directly with the big industrialists. At the level of national policy, the corporations became spectators of the new direction taken by the economy.</p> <p>The corporate system became a vast and unwieldy bureaucracy. Far from rationalising production and encouraging enterprise this corporate bureaucracy became a brake on economic development and an additional obstacle to be overcome by entrepreneurs. The corporations played no part in defining economic policy or developing the economy. Employers had undue influence within the corporations, especially as the workers' representatives were selected by the Fascist Party or the ministry of corporations, rather than being chosen directly by the workers. Only on other less significant issues such as sick pay for workers and the belated introduction of paid national holidays in 1938 did the corporations further workers' interests. The employers were nearly always supported by the three government representatives, who were Fascist Party members, even though they were supposed to be neutral. The corporations' voice was subordinate to Mussolini. The economy remained in private ownership and the government worked alongside and in support of large private firms. The regime allowed major companies to merge into near-monopoly organisations. For example, Fiat controlled car manufacturing, Pirelli the rubber industry and Montecatini the chemicals industry. The imposition by the government of wage cuts in 1927, 1930 and 1934 reduced wages below the cost of living; these were facilitated by the weakness of Fascist unions, and the unbalanced corporative structure. All this fitted with fascist ideas on the overriding importance of the state and the subordination of citizens to the purposes of the state. The Corporate State gained the support and further approval of the Catholic Church to the regime. The corporate state was a useful propaganda device for the fascist regime both internally and internationally. Italian propaganda presented it as a unique 'middle way' between the failed anarchy of capitalism and the oppressive command economy favoured by communists. The corporate state has been seen largely as a means of sharing power between Fascism and the economic interests of the landowners and industrialists. It was more about creating a subservient labour force than about providing a structure capable of undertaking genuine economic change. It acted as an effective tool for the centralising fascist state to control the working classes. Strikes and lockouts were made illegal by the Rocco Law in 1926 and independent trade unions were also abolished. Hence, it can be concluded that Fascist Italy had complete control over the labour force but very little control over the nation's economic structure.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Analyse the reasons for Stalin gaining power by 1929.</b></p> <p>Stalin rose to this unprecedented level of power as a result of his capabilities and his understanding of the workings of the Communist Party. Stalin translated these strengths into total control of the Soviet Union after the Russian Civil War (1917–20). Stalin was not the natural successor of Vladimir Lenin, but he was able to use his position within the Soviet Communist Party to become the undisputed leader of the Soviet Union. Stalin made his reputation during the Russian Civil War. He was appointed as a Political Commissar to several Generals and ensured that they were loyal to the Bolsheviks. Eventually, he was given a military command and brutally suppressed White Counterrevolutionaries and bandits. Lenin was worried about the influence of Trotsky, and he employed Stalin to build up a base of support for him. Stalin did this but also at the same time, built up a body of supporters that were loyal to him in the Party. In 1921, Stalin was appointed to the position of General Secretary. This position gave him great power in the Party. Stalin created a network of supporters in the Party. Lenin became suspicious of Stalin and was beginning to mistrust his former protégée. Despite Lenin's doubts, Stalin began to grow popular with the rank-and-file Party members. Unlike Lenin and Trotsky, he was not an intellectual and had the common touch, and he was well-liked by many. In 1922, after surgery, Lenin had a stroke and many feared that he would not have long to live. Lenin was largely confined to a country retreat and cut off from politics. Stalin, the General Secretary of the Communist Party, was one of the few people who still had access to him. Stalin used his position to cut Lenin off from the party and effectively to isolate him. He knew that Lenin's disliked him because Lenin perceived him as cruel and authoritarian. As the relationship between Lenin and Stalin deteriorated, Lenin dictated his Testament. This Testament was, in effect, his analysis of the current Bolshevik Party, the future of the Revolution and an indictment of Stalin's character. Lenin called for the removal of Stalin as General Secretary. Before Lenin could publish the Testament, he suffered a heart attack and was paralyzed. Stalin received the Testament from one of Lenin's secretaries, who was his agent. Stalin repressed Lenin's criticism of him. If the Testament had come to light Stalin's career would have been finished. Allies of Stalin colluded to repress all mention of the document. Lenin died of a suspected stroke on January 21st, 1924. Stalin was given the honour of organizing the official funeral. Stalin also gave an oration at the funeral, despite the opposition of Lenin's widow. Stalin under the rules of the Party was now the de-facto successor of Lenin. However, the party was not under his control, he had to share power with a collection of other Soviet leaders, including Trotsky, Zinoviev, and Kamenev. Stalin was officially the leader of the Communist party, but to many in the Party, he was only a figurehead. Many dismissed him as a nonentity and a political figure of no real substance. Many prominent Bolsheviks had always underestimated Stalin because he was not well educated. Trotsky, Kamenev, and Zinoviev all saw themselves as the logical choice as the successor of Lenin. However, they were not as popular as they believed, and that Stalin was very popular with the ordinary Party member.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Stalin was shrewd enough not to appear to be seeking the leadership of the Party. Furthermore, Stalin publicly denounced Kamenev and Zinoviev when they tried to involve him in a conspiracy against Trotsky in 1925. The rivalry between Trotsky and Stalin was not only personal because both men had radically different views on the nature of Communism. More importantly, they held antithetical ideas on the future of the worldwide Communist revolt. Influenced by Marx, the Bolsheviks, believed that there was going to be a world-wide Communist Revolution. Stalin began advocating 'Socialism in One Country,' which says that the Bolsheviks should focus building communism in the countries they already controlled rather than spreading the revolution. Stalin placed himself in ideological opposition to Trotsky. The Party accepted Stalin's position, and this meant that Trotsky was increasingly marginalised. He then decided to organize public protests, along with others, against Stalin's growing control of the Party. However, Stalin, employed a law passed by Lenin, ordering unity in the Party (Ban on Factions). Stalin asserted that Trotsky, was trying to split the party and this ploy managed to side-line Trotsky even further. Another factor, in the growing isolation of Leon Trotsky, was his Jewish heritage. There was a great deal of antisemitism in Russian, and this made Trotsky unpopular. By 1927, Stalin was so powerful that he could force Trotsky, Kamenev, and Zinoviev from the Politburo and later expelled from the Bolshevik Party. Trotsky was forced into exile. Increasingly, Stalin appointed his loyalists to the Politburo. Many of Lenin's former lieutenants realised that Stalin was making himself a de-facto dictator. Bukharin led the opposition to Stalin in the Politburo. He opposed Stalin's policy of rapid industrialisation. Stalin prevailed, and later he had Bukharin expelled as he turned against the New Economic Policy.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>'Terror was the crucial factor in the Nazi regime consolidating its power in Germany by 1934.' Evaluate this view.</b></p> <p>The period 1933 to 1934 saw the Nazi consolidation of power known as the Gleichshaltung. Various events need examining and assessing. These might include the Reichstag Fire, the Emergency Decree for the Protection of the People, the banning of the Communist Party (KPD), the March election, the Enabling Act, the Civil Service Law, the banning of all other political parties, the closing of the Reichsrat, the Night of the Long Knives and the purge of the Sturmabteilung (SA), the death of President Hindenburg, creation of the new role of Fuhrer and the Armed Forces swearing personal allegiance to Hitler. At the same time, the growth of the Terror State and the growth of the Gestapo and the SS under Himmler. The opening of the concentration camps at Dachau and Sachsenhausen and the introduction of protective custody and the Nazification of the police and legal systems needs examining too as it adds to the creation of a police state. The consolidation of power was achieved by creating a state of panic and crisis with the Reichstag Fire, which in turn allowed the banning of the communists, electoral success in the March election where the Nazis won 288 seats and then a combination of trickery and physical intimidation by the Sturmabteilung to ensure that the Enabling Law was passed. This was the foundation stone of the Nazi dictatorship as it allowed the Reichstag to be turned into a one-party assembly and the removal of the last vestiges of Weimar Democracy. Terror was more evident in the use of the Gestapo and the SS and with the murder of the SA leadership at Bad Wiessee during the Night of the Long Knives. This allowed the Nazi to remove a potential threat in Ernst Rohm and settle old scores such as the murder of General von Schleicher and Gregor Strasser. The death of President Hindenburg allowed for a final usurpation of the Weimar Constitution and removal of the final check on Nazi power. Propaganda, reducing unemployment and the Nazification of all walks of life were also begun and formed a part of the consolidation of power. The key here is to look at the various strands to consolidation and to assess the role of terror amongst the other methods used.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>Assess the extent to which the role and status of women in Britain changed in the period 1919–39.</b></p> <p>During the war women had taken on many working roles traditionally associated with men, most notably in the munitions Industry and post-war hoped for further change. After the First World War many returning servicemen reclaimed the available jobs, and the numbers of women workers, particularly in industry and trade, declined. During the 1920s and 30s the UK economy was plunged into a recession leading to very high levels of unemployment and it was not surprising that many women who tried to find work that made use of the skills they had gained in the industries during the First World War were vilified by the press for ‘taking up ex-servicemen’s jobs’. Although unemployment benefit had been introduced through the National Insurance Act 1911, women were not eligible for benefits if they refused to take up available jobs in domestic service. This forced women back towards what was considered ‘women’s work’ including laundry, dressmaking, domestic work, and work in ‘sweated industries’. During this period, the government replicated women’s unequal pay rates in the labour market by setting the unemployment benefit for women at a lower rate than that for men. However, some job opportunities in new industries and professions did open up for women through the 1920s and 30s.</p> <p>Following the Education Act of 1918 which raised the school leaving age to 14, women were better educated. The Sex Disqualification Act of 1919 made it somewhat easier for women to go to university and take up professional jobs as teachers, nurses and a few even qualified as doctors. Middle class women benefited from these increased opportunities. During this time women began to get jobs in increasing numbers in the civil service accounting for about a quarter of all such posts by 1935, though these were mostly at clerical and administrative grades rather than the technical and professional jobs which were still dominated by men. Some jobs in new and existing industries came to be considered ‘women’s work’ such as assembly work in the engineering, electrical, food and drink industries, as well as clerical work, typing and counter-sales. However, these jobs were low paid and involved long working hours and shift work. Women workers were usually excluded from supervisory roles or work that was considered to be ‘skilled’, despite women’s successful roles in such jobs during the First World War. By the 1930s about one third of British women over the age of 15 worked outside the home, of whom nearly a third still worked in domestic service. However, only one tenth of married women worked. Predominant social expectations at that time reinforced the view that caring, and cooking was exclusively ‘women’s work’. Indeed, without electrical appliances like washing machines, domestic labour was time-consuming and hard work. The civil service, the education sector and new professions operated a ‘marriage bar’, which meant that women had to resign their posts when they got married. Even those who defied these unofficial rules found that it was impossible to continue working once they had children. Trade unions, which were led by men, continued to be concerned that women would be employed as cheap labour in these new industries.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>The wartime demand for wage equality had previously been utilised to recruit women to trade unions. But during the inter-war years most unions drew back from this demand. Instead, they actively campaigned to restrict women's employment in certain industries by calling for the stricter implementation of a 'marriage bar' or the introduction of such a bar in new industries. So, in the interwar years, the goal of equal pay receded. By 1931, a working woman's weekly wage had returned to the pre-war situation of half the male rate in most industries. During this period, women gained the right to vote and this led to some early attempts to mobilise the women's votes on issues of concern to women, including issues at work. Women over 30 gained the vote in 1918, however, the suffrage movement had been a campaign about women's political status, not about women's role in society. The vote did not lead to a large increase in female elected representatives – between 1918 and 1931, only 1.5% of Conservative candidates were women, while Labour did not do much better with only 3.9% of candidates being women. On top of this, those that did stand were less likely to win. Another issue which limited the changes to women's position in society was the conservatism of many women. One of the first female MPs, the Duchess of Atholl, had previously been an opponent of women's suffrage, while even Emmeline Pankhurst, a prominent campaigner for women's suffrage, stood as a candidate for the Conservative Party in 1927; a party that was experiencing division over whether to allow more women the vote. The British political landscape was to remain essentially a man's world for some time. By 1927, the issue of universal suffrage was a prominent topic of discussion. As with the Act in 1918, it was hotly contested, even if the motivations and argument were often different. Many people within the Establishment were very concerned about allowing millions of women, many of whom would be working-class, to vote. In 1928 the Representation of the People (Equal Franchise) Act was passed which gave women the same voting rights as men. The matter was not as simple as one Party introducing it and their majority securing them the votes; the Conservative Party in government was so divided on the issue that they relied on Liberal and Labour votes to ensure it became law.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p><b>Evaluate the reasons for Truman’s victory in the 1948 presidential election.</b></p> <p>Truman had not had a strong popular following since taking over from Roosevelt in 1945 and opinion polls and the mid-term elections for Congress pointed to a Republican victory in 1948. However, there were elements of his policies that indicated that he could appeal to Democratic voters such as his support of social reforms like health reform, minimum wage and federal housing. He also pleased trade unions by vetoing the Taft-Hartley Bill. His modest support for civil rights gained liberal approval and black votes. Though there was opposition among Southern Democrats in the end this did not prove electorally decisive. Also, his foreign policy gained support. He took a firm and unambiguous anti-Communist line and was seen by conservatives as taking a leadership role in the Truman Doctrine while his support for the new state of Israel in May 1948 won Jewish support. There was some uncertainty about his presidential style and the Republicans had considerable support for their opposition to the high-level state interventions of the New Deal. Truman had not been a high-profile figure in the Democratic party before becoming Vice President and there was some consideration of offering the 1948 nomination to Eisenhower, then thought to be a Democrat. So, while Truman did have some growing support, the election was still thought in 1948 to be likely to go to Dewey.</p> <p>In 1948 Truman won the support of the more liberal Democrats and took a strong line in actively opposing the Republican-dominated Congress by putting forward a legislative programme and challenging his opponents to defeat it and thus appear to be negative. His opponent Thomas Dewey was younger and progressive but his personality was seen as somewhat cold and aloof and he lacked the folksy, direct appeal of Truman.</p> <p>When Congress rejected Truman’s legislative reforms in July 1948 he warned the country that the achievements of the new Deal were under threat. Truman showed energy in desegregating the armed forces and ending discrimination in the Civil Service. He could afford to worry less about the South as there was a separate Dixiecrat candidate in Strom Thurmond which split the ‘white south vote’ and focus on winning the black and liberal vote. Truman showed himself an active campaigner undertaking a number of whistle stop tours of the US and showing greater energy than Dewey, whose campaign was more restrained and bland. Dewey seemed rather academic compared with the more down to earth style of Truman.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>For all that the polls were still predicting a Dewey win on election day but in the event Truman gained 49.5% to Dewey's 45.1%. The four southern states that went to Thurmond were balanced by greater support from the mid-west and key groups like trade unions, some farming interests, the black vote even though more Americans voted against him than for him. Discussion might be about whether Truman's personal qualities and his determined campaigning in the face of unfavourable polls and the predictions of defeat together with his reforming policies and strong anti-Communist stance were they key element or whether Dewey and the Republicans were too complacent and misjudged the public mood in resolutely opposing Truman's plans in Congress. Alternatively, the context of the Cold War and the desire of many Americans to stick with a known figure in what were seen as difficult times might be stressed as well as the residual loyalty of many to the New Deal.</p>	<b>30</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p><b>‘Kennedy’s domestic policies promised more than they delivered.’ Assess this view.</b></p> <p>Though much of Kennedy’s idealism was concerned with foreign policy, his rhetoric included ‘The New Frontier’ in July 1960. In order to meet the challenges of a recession, his economic programme looked to lower taxes and to help increase employment, raise the minimum wage and to support business and housing. There were proposals for greater federal support for education and medical care, more public transport and aid to Appalachia which was seen as a needy and depressed region. There was also rhetoric about improvements in civil rights. The tone of the new administration was progressive and forward looking with references to ‘The Hundred Days’ and the charisma of the president and his ‘Camelot’ had an atmosphere of change after the Republican years. It could be seen that much of the promise was implicit – the New Frontier was not a carefully costed and systematic programme of change. In practice, Kennedy was not in a position to pass changes on the level of the New Deal or even Johnson’s later Great Society because of the restrictions by Congress. His own Democrats prevented a proposed Department of Urban Affairs. Disagreements over federal aid to church schools prevented education reform from being put into place. Medical aid for older people did not materialise. There were some achievements in the form of a raised minimum wage and the Appalachian regional aid programme was instrumental in raising living standards in a very depressed region. Tax cuts were not as great as promised but increased arms spending did boost the economy – though this was more a by- product of other priorities of the administration. Kennedy faced a very difficult task in supporting progress in civil rights in the face of increasing demands while maintaining the vital support of Southern Democrats in Congress. Kennedy followed the precedent of using federal force to support desegregation in the case of James Meredith in Mississippi in 1962 and in September 1963 following the bombing of an African American Church in Birmingham Alabama. But it took until 1963 for Kennedy to introduce a general Civil Rights Bill and though he made some appointments of African Americans to office, in general the pace of change in civil rights has been seen as quite slow and actions have been seen to fall behind expressions of sympathy and support for a growing Civil Rights movement. The discussion could be about achievements in the face of Congressional opposition both within his own party and by the Southern Democrats and whether the measures taken bore fruit in the future, or whether the rhetoric was over ambitious and misleading.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
7	<p><b>'Foreign competition was the greatest challenge to the US economy in the 1980s and early 1990s.' Assess this view.</b></p> <p>The 1980s saw a growing trade deficit which stood at an unprecedented \$123.3 billion in 1984. This had benefits for the consumer and in keeping down prices and acted as a spur to more efficient domestic production where it was possible to become more cost effective. However, US businesses unable to reduce costs or to meet foreign competition did suffer and there were job losses as some industries had to move production overseas.</p> <p>The economic problems of the 1970s were still being felt in the early 1980s. The rise in oil prices ended the era of cheap energy. Inflation was allied to economic stagnation with declining business confidence and the foreign competition. Thus, this element has to be seen in context, but the US found itself with a significant trade deficit and its businesses faced high quality foreign competition from a range of products from automobiles to electronics. In an effort to reduce the central problem of inflation, there were restrictions on money supply and federal deregulation in the hope that competition would decrease prices and prices would fall with less money in circulation. Thus, the early 1980s saw a recession with a considerable rise in bankruptcies, falling agricultural prices, reduced internal demand and high interest rates. By 1983 inflation was under control and the annual inflation rate remained at under 5% in the mid-1980s and early 1990s.</p> <p>Under Reagan the control of inflation was a priority as were the promotion of consumer spending by tax cuts and heavy defence expenditure. The agricultural sector did less well and there was a continuing problem with trade deficits which continued from the 1970s. Domestic demand swelled by federal deficits created a demand for imports met from growing Asian economies. The competition from Japan with its thriving economy based on close cooperation between government and major industries and financial institutions on a different basis from the US capitalist model offered highly developed technological products which challenged US producers. There was also the problem faced in the US by corporate restructuring. The growing economies of Asia offered competition to this more wasteful capitalist model. However, with the 1990s the change in Europe and the greater opportunities for trade with the new nations of the former soviet bloc and greater technological expansion in the US did change the situation. Recession in Japan reduced competition, there was a change in the nature of the workforce, greater stress on services and hi-tech production and a shift away from the agriculture sector meaning that the US became more competitive. The US moved away from traditional protectionism but the free trade policies did mean competition from lower cost economies in the global market. There were some effects, particularly in traditional industries, but in general the advantages outweighed the disadvantages, and growth rates in the US increased in the early 1990s, so that problems of those who had to adjust to structural change were greater than problems which were brought about directly by trading deficits and competition.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
8	<p><b>Evaluate the reasons for the escalation of United States involvement in Vietnam after 1963.</b></p> <p>From 1947 US policy had been concerned with the containment of communism and many had the assumption of an ambitious communist world wanting to impose its authority on the world as stated in NSC-68. After 1954 the US offered its support to South Vietnam. Thus, Kennedy inherited Cold War beliefs and policies. He had stated as early as 1956 that Vietnam was the cornerstone of the Free World and in his inaugural stated that the US would pay any price for the survival of liberty. This idealistic rhetoric tied Kennedy into increasing involvement, regardless of concerns about the viability of defending the South. Johnson, too, believed in the domino theory and that the whole strategic and political position of the US depended on defending South Vietnam. US thinking was focused on the strategic importance of Vietnam between India and Australia and New Zealand. There was the fear that a communist victory would lead to Chinese expansion. The whole security of the US and its position in Southeast Asia was endangered. Moved by fears of loss of US prestige and leadership of the Free World and unable to negotiate with China or get North Vietnam to withdraw support for insurgency in the South, Johnson moved towards escalation as the South Vietnamese regimes lacked the stability to fight alone. The memories of the blame that Truman had received for allowing the CCP into power in 1949, the successful defence of South Korea and fears that Taiwan or even Japan might fall if there was communist victory in Vietnam were important. However, the belief in the power of US military force backed by its airpower technology and economic strength led to a belief that victory was possible, even without the armed support of other western powers. Initially public opinion was not as hostile as it became and US military leaders were positive. The Gulf of Tonkin incident gave some justification for escalation and the emergence of Thieu in 1967 gave some hope that South Vietnam might have a stable government. The increasing commitment in military terms made it harder to stop the war or scale it down. Johnson did not want to seem militarily weak or to be seen to have wasted US lives. It was not evident that the efforts to suppress the Viet Cong had met with such limited success until the Tet offensive but even then there was no real chance of the US losing in formal battles. The problems of disengagement were such that commitment could not easily be terminated and alternative strategies such as heavy bombing or Vietnamisation offered hope.</p> <p>Discussion might centre on the relative importance of ideological factors and factors which involved US strategic and political interests but the question does require a focus on escalation as well as explaining involvement per se.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
9	<p><b>‘The Cuban Missile Crisis was a defeat for the Soviet Union.’ Evaluate this view.</b></p> <p>The Cuban Missile Crisis ended in a clear victory for the United States. The Soviet Union agreed to move the missiles from Cuba and Kennedy’s image was strengthened domestically and internationally. In 1962, Khrushchev’s prestige had already fallen due to rifts with the military over stringent defence cuts in 1960, and rapid rises in food prices: this made the Soviets more critical of the 1962 events. Many important Russians believed Khrushchev had lost the crisis, seeing the outcome as a Soviet humiliation. Khrushchev had capitulated to the Americans; he was regarded as a failure and by 1964 he was replaced. Leonid Brezhnev became First Secretary and Alexei Kosygin was Premier. The Chinese also resented the Soviet Union’s withdrawal of the missiles and Mao Zedong accused Khrushchev of backing down with Khrushchev responding that Mao’s policies would lead to nuclear war. By 1962 China had become isolated from the Soviet Union. The Soviets had refused to support Chinese attempts to reach a settlement over Taiwan and the Chinese strongly opposed the Soviet pursuit of peaceful co-existence with the West. The removal of the missiles led to a new low in relations between the two countries and it was a further step towards the Sino-Soviet split which was a reality by 1965 when all contact between the two nations was severed. While, after an initial setback, the Soviet Union was able to maintain a good relationship with Cuba after Castro’s initial outrage, it proved to be costly as Cuba became economically dependent on Soviet markets.</p> <p>Khrushchev had maintained that he had placed the missiles in Cuba to maintain the independence of the Cubans. After the crisis Cuba remained a communist country and it appeared that the United States had altered its policy towards Cuba having pledged not to invade it. They had sponsored an invasion of the country in 1961, were planning a new one and had never accepted Castro’s regime. The Soviets were thus aiming to defend Cuba from a US attack and they also wanted strategic parity as the United States had missiles in Turkey next to the Soviet border. Khrushchev may have also wanted to exert pressure to try to resolve the problem of Berlin. However, the escalation of the crisis meant that his main aim became to defuse it. Nevertheless, as well as obtaining a US pledge not to invade Cuba, a secret agreement that the Jupiter missiles would be removed from Turkey was made. The deal was reached privately in a conversation between Robert Kennedy and Ambassador Dobrynin. The secrecy of this agreement which Khrushchev kept to avoid Cuban anger gave the public perception that Khrushchev had agreed to remove the missiles from Cuba without anything in return. In fact, Soviet long-range missiles could already reach the United States from Russia itself, so the missiles in Cuba did not really pose a new national security threat.</p>	30

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
9	<p>Both sides mutually benefited from the establishment of the 'crisis hotline', a direct telephone link between the White House and the Kremlin. The crisis also led to the signing of the Limited Test-Ban Treaty in Moscow on August 5, 1963, by the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom that banned all tests of nuclear weapons except those conducted underground. Both sides also learnt that risking nuclear war in pursuit of political objects was far too risky. The two powers continued to fight each other in proxy wars in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and southern Africa and competed in the space race. There was now a move towards détente as well as further arms control treaties.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
10	<p><b>‘The Korean War resulted in stalemate with few positive outcomes.’ Assess this view.</b></p> <p>The war ended in a truce and the countries remained divided at the 38th parallel. Bombing destroyed much of North Korea’s agricultural lands and most of its transportation system. North Korea’s population declined by 12% from 1949 to 1953. The South, too, suffered significant loss of life and families were separated. Other negative consequences were specific to the countries involved. The United States defended South Korea at a cost estimated at \$15 billion and over 54 000 deaths and it also failed to rollback communism from North Korea. Cold war tensions with the Soviet Union remained high. The Soviet Union failed to achieve its objective of unifying the Korean peninsula under Kim Il Sung. Its relations with China were damaged and the countries of the capitalist bloc were united. The United States still refused to normalise relations with the People’s Republic of China. China’s involvement in the war meant that it lost the opportunity to unite Taiwan with China. Truman had assumed that Taiwan would inevitably fall to Beijing, but the outbreak of the Korean War prompted him to intervene again and send the Seventh Fleet to neutralise the Taiwan Strait. During the war, an estimated 21 800 Chinese troops were taken prisoner by the Allies; over two-thirds refused to return to China and settled in Taiwan. In addition, the war contributed to the decline of Sino-Soviet relations; there was the view that the Soviets had just used them as proxies. China had a Soviet loan to pay for Soviet arms. The Korean War also had an impact on the broader Cold War conflict and changed the course of the war itself. The Korean War was the first armed confrontation of the Cold War, which initially began as an ideological war between the nations and set the standard for many later conflicts. It embodied the idea of a ‘proxy war’, where the two superpowers would fight via another country, forcing the people in that nation to suffer the bulk of the destruction and death involved in a war between such large nations.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
10	<p>The Korean War sped up the conclusion of a peace agreement between the United States and Japan and the creation of military and political blocs, ANZUS in 1951 and SEATO in 1954. South Korea was saved from communism. The United States' policy of containment was successful. A further result of the Korean War was the beginning of racial integration in the US military service. Korea also played an important role in sustaining Taiwan's economic stability. Truman's decision to send American warships to the Formosa Strait as well as an increase in aid is evidence of this. By entering and fighting in the Korean War, China achieved its original goal to keep North Korea from falling. The fact that Chinese forces held their own against United Nations' forces boosted China's standing as a world power. Much of the material used in the war was bought from nearby Japan which had a positive impact on its economy. Japan also became an invaluable base for the United States in the Korean conflict. The Korean War resulted in significant advancements in technology as the Russians and the Americans invested heavily in technology to outdo each other, both in the missile race and in the space race, which were major events of the Cold War. The authority of the Soviet Union had grown as demonstrated by its readiness to interfere in developing countries to promote socialism. and the fact that it was not heavily involved militarily limited its costs. The Korean War was the first war in which the UN participated; it was argued that it showed that the UN was a powerful organisation for helping to keep peace in the world.</p>	<b>30</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
11	<p><b>Analyse the role of Kenyatta's leadership in achieving independence for Kenya.</b></p> <p>The aftermath of the Second World War strengthened African nationalist movements and imperial powers were made to take the prospect of decolonisation more seriously. African nationalists played a large part in dictating the pace. During the war demands for independence became more widespread and could no longer be ignored. The British government's attitude also helped to account for the granting of independence to colonies; it was prepared to grant independence if it felt viable political units would be created. In the 1950s the British East Africa Federation was created combining Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda but the outbreak of the Mau Mau rebellion in Kenya led to the end of this federation. The Mau Mau movement was a militant African nationalist group that opposed British colonial rule and its exploitation of the native population. The rebellion occurred due to the tension between the white settlers and the Kikuyu tribe; this tribe had been affected more by white settlement and felt more bitter. They were convinced that their cause was just. Mau Mau members carried out violent attacks against colonial leaders and white settlers.</p> <p>In 1952, the colonial government declared a state of emergency and arrested many Kenyan independence leaders, including moderates who had little or no connection to the Mau Mau, like Jomo Kenyatta, president of the Kenya African Union. Between 1952 and 1956, the British defeated the Mau Mau through a brutal campaign of military action and widespread detention of the Kikuyu. However, the Mau Mau Rebellion also persuaded the British that social, political and agrarian reforms were necessary. In 1957, the British allowed the first direct elections of native leaders to the Legislative Council and by 1960, Africans were a majority in the council. Kenya became independent on December 12, 1963, seven years after the collapse of the uprising. Many argue that the Mau Mau uprising was the catalyst for decolonisation as it showed that colonial control could only be maintained through the use of extreme force.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
11	<p>In 1946 Jomo Kenyatta became the leader of the Kenya African Union (KAU). He tried to gather support for his political plan for constitutional reform and he appealed to all Kenyans to unite behind the KAU and distanced himself from the Mau Mau. However, in October 1952, Kenyatta was arrested along with five colleagues, having been accused by the British of organising the Mau Mau rebellion. He was sent to prison and the KAU was banned. In 1960 the state of emergency ended and Britain announced plans to prepare Kenya for majority African rule. The Kenya African National Union (KANU) was formed in 1960 and general elections were held for the first time in February 1961. KANU received more votes but refused to participate in government until Kenyatta was released. The Asian Kenya Freedom Party and numerous independent candidates joined in the protest and, as political pressure built up, Kenyatta was finally released in August 1961 becoming President of KANU. KANU and the Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU) debated on the form of government most suited to a free Kenya. In the meantime, Kenyatta agreed to a coalition government until independence. The first universal elections in the country took place in May 1963, with a resounding victory for Kenyatta and the KANU party. On June 1, 1963, Kenyatta became the first Prime Minister of Kenya. As head of state, he created an image of himself as father of the nation. He became regarded as a shield against radical nationalists.</p>	<b>30</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
12	<p><b>Assess the view that Nasser was a ‘popular failure’ in his handling of the Arab-Israeli conflict.</b></p> <p>The Arab defeat in the 1948–49 War spurred Nasser and other army officers to overthrow King Farouk in 1952. By 1954 Nasser was the President of Egypt.</p> <p>Nasser was determined to be the champion of Arab nationalism by defying the West and making it a unifying movement. The Israelis were angry because Egypt had been encouraging Palestinian raids into Israel; they wanted to show Nasser as militarily weak. In February 1955 Israeli troops destroyed the Egyptian army headquarters in Gaza killing 35 soldiers. However, far from humiliating Nasser, it spurred him on to arm and train fedayeen guerrillas to conduct attacks in Israel. He also struck an arms deal with Czechoslovakia which led to the Suez Crisis. Britain and the United States withdrew their loan for the building of the Aswan Dam and in retaliation Nasser nationalised the Suez Canal Company in July 1956 with the intention of using the profits to build the dam. On 29 October 1956, Israel invaded Egypt and on the following day Britain and France requested that they cease fighting otherwise they would use force. The Israelis agreed but the Egyptians refused. The US condemned the action of Britain and France and on 6 November the UN ordered them to withdraw. Nasser was regarded as a hero in the Arab world; he had gained complete control of the Suez Canal. Nasser had emerged as a popular leader and the Arab states became even more anti-western. In 1957 a Treaty of Arab Solidarity was signed by Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Nasser’s charismatic leadership promoted the rising tide of Arab nationalism. In 1958 Syria and Egypt formed the United Arab Republic; it only lasted for three years but Nasser’s popularity remained strong.</p> <p>In 1963 Nasser saw a new threat from Israel when the Israelis were in the process of completing a project to divert 75% of the water from the River Jordan to Israel. Nasser regarded this as an act of aggression to the whole Arab world. He called for a conference of Arab leaders resulting in the formation of the Palestine Liberation Organization in 1964. Nasser then denounced a speech by the Tunisian President suggesting that Arab states recognise Israel along the lines of the 1947 United Nations Palestine partition plan. He insisted that the only solution was to use force to liberate Palestine. Raids against Israel were encouraged. Through a series of miscalculations, he goaded Israel to launch a pre-emptive air strike on Egypt on the morning of June 5, 1967. In November 1966 he had signed a defence agreement with Syria and tension was high on the Israeli–Syrian border because of the raids. On 13 May the Soviet Union warned the Egyptian government that the Israelis were moving armed forces to the border with Syria which was untrue. Nasser knew this was untrue but he wanted to show that he was the leader of the Arab world and he embarked on a policy of brinkmanship with Israel which included closing the Straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping. The Israelis’ response was to launch a pre-emptive attack which resulted in defeat for the Arabs. Despite his defeat Nasser was able to retain his popularity in the Arab World until his death in 1970 by emphasising his commitment to pan-Arabism, his firm belief in Palestinian rights and the eventual destruction of Israel. His failure to realise his aim of destroying Israel did not destroy the support of the people.</p>	30