

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/43

Paper 4 (Depth Study), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

| | | | |
|---------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 43 |

Generic Levels of Response

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|---|
| Level 5 | 25–30 | <p>Responses show very good understanding of the question and contain a relevant, focused and balanced argument, fully supported by appropriate factual material and based on a consistently analytical approach.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses might be expected to be analytical, focused and balanced throughout. The candidate will be in full control of the argument and will reach a supported judgement in response to the question.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses might typically be analytical, consistent and balanced, but the argument might not be fully convincing.</p> |
| Level 4 | 19–24 | <p>Responses show a good understanding of the question and contain a relevant argument based on a largely analytical approach.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses are likely to be analytical, balanced and effectively supported. There may be some attempt to reach a judgement but this may be partial or unsupported.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses are likely to contain detailed and accurate factual material with some focused analysis, but the argument is inconsistent or unbalanced.</p> |
| Level 3 | 13–18 | <p>Responses show understanding of the question and contain appropriate factual material. The material may lack depth. Some analytical points may be made but these may not be highly developed or consistently supported.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses contain detailed and accurate factual material. However, attempts to argue relevantly are implicit or confined to introductions and conclusions. Alternatively, responses may offer an analytical framework which contains some supporting material.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses might offer narrative or description relating to the topic, but are less likely to address the terms of the question.</p> |
| Level 2 | 7–12 | <p>Responses show some understanding of the demands of the question. They may be descriptive with few links to the question or may be analytical with limited relevant factual support.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses might contain relevant commentaries which lack adequate factual support. The responses may contain some unsupported assertions.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses are likely to contain some information which is relevant to the topic but may only offer partial coverage.</p> |
| Level 1 | 1–6 | <p>Responses show limited understanding of the question. They may contain some description which is linked to the topic or only address part of the question.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses show some awareness of relevant material but this may be presented as a list.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, answers may provide a little relevant material but are likely to be characterised by irrelevance.</p> |
| Level 0 | 0 | No relevant, creditworthy content. |

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 3 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 43 |

Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–1941

Indicative Content

1 ‘Lenin failed to solve Russia’s economic problems.’ How far do you agree? [30]

An analysis of Russia’s economic problems in 1917–18 and then of Lenin’s attempts to manage them is expected here. An examination of the situation in 1917–18 would indicate an inheritance of staggering difficulty, and a contrast with the situation in 1924 shows substantial progress, admittedly from a low base.

Total breakdown was the order of the day on Bolshevik accession to power. Infrastructure had collapsed, there was anarchy in the countryside, the governing and managerial class had largely disappeared. Brest-Litovsk saw the disappearance of food and raw materials, civil war raged throughout large parts of Russia as well as foreign invasions. War Communism evidently failed and famine and cannibalism were features of Russia at the time. Hostility to the regime was endemic, both within and outside Russia. The money economy had collapsed and inflation was out of control.

By 1924, the situation had changed radically. Central planning was coming in. The NEP ensured that food production recommenced and that a money economy was beginning to return to normal. Industrial production did not reach 1913 levels until 1926, and then it was only by making use of existing assets. There was a growing awareness of what the problems were by 1924 and a debate growing about possible solutions. Arguably he did little more than apply cosmetic measures to ensure temporary survival and left the attempt to apply an ideologically-based solution to his successors. The evidence points to ‘yes’ but ‘any’ might seem harsh.

2 ‘Clever propaganda was the reason why Mussolini stayed in power for so long.’ Discuss this view. [30]

The central issue here is the reasons behind Mussolini’s tenure of power. He was a brilliant propagandist and many of the techniques he developed, both in the press and on the radio, were copied by others such as Goebbels and Stalin. His ability to use all the media available as well as his own oratorical skills was impressive. He could prevent any opposition gaining an outlet for his views and he utilised indirect means, ranging from the classroom to the pulpit, to help get his views across. He enabled a focus on what he perceived might get support for the regime and ignore what might alienate support. Repression played a part, but the OVRA was nowhere near as efficient or effective a force as the Gestapo or NKVD, and the evidence is that it did not need to be.

The way in which he repressed, using castor oil and exile rather than Night of the Long Knives and the Gulags, may have also played a part in diminishing opposition. Mack Smith tried to analyse support in the mid-1930s, but was reduced to saying that some felt that the majority despised Mussolini and his regime while others said that, given a free vote, over 80% would back him. There were few, if any, alternatives and while he may not have been better in reality than his predecessors, he certainly was not any worse. He seems to give Italy some self-respect, and the adulation that greeted his acquisition of ‘empire’ was genuine. The way he linked many of the ruling classes to the regime via the corporate state was clever. He was tolerated, if not more, until he manifestly failed to deliver.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 43 |

3 ‘Collectivisation was a disastrous policy for the USSR.’ How far do you agree? [30]

The issue here is an analysis of the impact of the collectivisation of agriculture on Russia. There is a case against. War Communism had not worked and the NEP arguably was little more than a short term solution. It might have led to a return to 1913 levels, but that was insufficient for any industrial growth and it was not an efficient method of farming. Russian agriculture had barely moved on in methods from mediaeval times; the wooden plough was the order of the day. In addition, Stalin felt that the Kulak was a threat to socialism and that the state was losing control of the countryside with the growth of peasant unions and reaction in the countryside. Grain requisition was still needed and there was little incentive in rural areas to use new technology or scientific methods of eradicating pests or fertilising.

There was a valid economic case for: prices might stabilise and get controlled, productivity should increase and much needed labour would be released for industrial development. After all, the ‘mir’ had always had a ‘communal’ basis. By 1941, 98% of land had been collectivised, but the most productive parts of the countryside were the peasants’ private plots. The idea might have been sound, in theory, but the practice was disastrous. While the impact on Russia is well known, with one of the largest man-made famines of all time, the even more terrifying implications for outer regions such as Kazakhstan are only just becoming known and ‘0’s are being added to the total death toll. The slaughter of livestock and the ‘fundamental idiocy’ of it took decades to recover from. Later experiments like Khrushchev’s virgin lands policy showed that political control, especially when it has an ideological underpinning, can be disastrous.

4 ‘Hitler’s social policies were inconsistent and incoherent.’ How far do you agree? [30]

The issue here is an analysis of Hitler’s various social policies, ranging from the socio-economic to the anti-Semitic, and commenting on the extent to which they were inspired by ideology or pragmatism or were little more than temporary and ill thought out solutions to immediate problems. Mein Kampf gives little insight as does an analysis of Hitler’s speeches in the run up to his accession to power in 1933. Historians disagree on the issue from 1933 onwards. The ambivalent role of the party within the state is used as an example to illustrate the lack of clear thinking on social issues in Nazism.

The extent to which the economy was subordinated to military preparation lends itself to supporting the idea that there was coherence there, and the development of the Hitler Youth and the attitude towards women reinforces this view. Anti-Semitism was ever present, but the extent to which it undermined other policies leads to the ‘incoherent’ point of view.

There is ample evidence to support both sides of the argument, with the prevailing consensus amongst historians being that there was a degree of coherence there in that all was subordinated to wider, if rather vague, aspirations. The role of women in Nazi Germany lends itself well to the debate here. On the one hand, there was the ‘Kinder, Küche, Kirche’ approach, which had to be modified when there was a labour shortage. Be prepared to be flexible when it comes to deciding what should come under the umbrella of ‘social’ policies.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 43 |

Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–1990

Indicative Content

5 How far was the Federal Government responsible for economic prosperity in the 1950s? [30]

The economic growth of the 1950s was certainly exceptional; by 1960, median family income was 30% higher than it had been in 1950; unemployment was low, as was the rate of inflation. Why? A range of factors played their part, one of which was Federal Government's economic policy. Eisenhower aimed to balance the Federal Government's budget and to reduce the national debt. He refused to reduce federal taxes as he saw the need for Federal Government expenditure, as evidenced by plans to build an interstate highway system from the mid-1950s. This investment in the road-building programme combined with the building of missiles and space satellites later in the decade helped stimulate economic development and growth.

The Federal Government's trade policy also stimulated growth. Talks at GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] led to the Geneva round of tariff reductions in 1955–59. In a decade when Japan and Europe had not fully recovered from the destruction of World War Two, this more liberal trading policy helped increase US exports.

However, many other factors caused the prosperity of the 50s. They included private sector innovation and investment, resulting in the growth of new products such as computers and colour televisions as well as transistor radios. [A case can be made that this innovation followed public sector investment in technologies needed to win wars, whether hot or cold.] The growth of consumer credit also helped increase wealth and growth; in this respect, the 1950s resembled the 1920s. Cheap oil also helped fuel economic growth, helping to stimulate demand for cars and trucks.

| | | | |
|---------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 43 |

6 How accurate is it to describe the Stonewall Riots of June 1969 as a ‘watershed’ in US history? [30]

The Stonewall Riots of June 1969 occurred at the Stonewall Inn in Greenwich Village, New York. A police raid on the bar used by gay men and lesbians resulted in the customers resisting police actions, the resulting fights eventually being labelled a riot. The resistance was spontaneous, not organised. Conflict persisted for several nights thereafter. Unlike previous police raids on gay bars, this gained a lot of press publicity, which in turn caused some public expressions of sympathy with those Americans subject to police harassment and brutality. This was one reason why the Stonewall Riots can be seen as a watershed or a turning point.

Beforehand, gay men and lesbians had rarely taken collective and physical action to resist police actions against them. They had formed their own associations. Gay Americans in Los Angeles formed the Mattachine Society in 1950, named after an all-male French masque group which wore masks when performing in public. At the time, this group in Los Angeles felt they needed to be masked as well. Many were Communists and the Mattachine Society was organised in a secretive, cell-like way similar to the Communist Party. An equivalent society of lesbians, Daughters of Bilitis, was formed in 1956 in San Francisco. However, these societies, though growing in the 1950s and 1960s, had little impact, despite some New York gays adopting direct action against refusal to serve them alcohol.

The Stonewall Riots were the first large-scale public protest by gay Americans. Once this breakthrough had occurred, events moved quickly. The Gay Liberation Front was established within weeks of the Stonewall Riots. It was a broad-based left-wing movement, basing its name on the National Liberation Front of North Vietnam. A few months later, the Gay Activists Alliance broke away from the GLF with the more specific aim of establishing the rights of gays and lesbians in US society. On the first anniversary of the Stonewall Riots, the first Gay Pride marches took place in New York, San Francisco and Chicago. However, many legal restrictions on the rights of gay Americans remained into the 1990s and beyond. Only in 2015 did the US Supreme Court decide that same-sex marriage should be legal in all fifty states of America. Compared with the 1960s, the social position of gay men and women undoubtedly changed for the better in the 1970s as other groups and governments came to accept their rights.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 7 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 43 |

7 'Reagan's re-election in 1984 was a triumph for the man rather than his policies.' How far do you agree? [30]

Ronald Reagan won the 1984 presidential election by the largest of margins: he won the Electoral College vote in 49 of 50, which meant he won 525 of 538 of the Electoral College votes. Why such a crushing victory? Firstly, the man himself. Reagan was more popular than the Republican Party. He won 59% of the popular vote in 1984. Republicans contesting Congressional elections in 1984 did not do as well; the Democrats kept control of both houses of Congress. His popularity was based in part on his personal skills. Reagan was the 'Great Communicator'. His easy-going manner, his fondness for jokes and the skills he learnt as a film actor meant he was able to establish a rapport with most Americans which was extremely rare. In addition, Reagan's message was positive and upbeat. His campaign slogans of 'It's morning in America' and 'America is back' gave positive messages which was in stark contrast to the downbeat nature of the Carter presidency and the uncharismatic nature of Walter Mondale, his rival in 1984.

On the other side, however, Reagan's policies were proving successful. By 1984, the economy was growing after the recession of the early 1980s. Inflation was falling, especially oil prices, as was unemployment, if more slowly. Again, this compared favourably with American memories of the Carter era. Foreign and defence policy was also successful in standing up to the 'evil empire' of the USSR. Reagan spent huge amounts of money on US weaponry, increasing the federal budget deficit to do so. The US invasion of the Caribbean island of Grenada in 1983 won him much popular approval as he showed determination to halt the advance of communism in America's backyard. Finally, Reagan's victory was less a triumph for Reagan or his policies and more a defeat for the personality, policies and party of his rival, Walter Mondale. Mondale was an average candidate, his party still demoralised by the defeats it had suffered in the 1970s.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 43 |

8 How far did President Eisenhower depart from the Cold War policies of President Truman? [30]

President Truman had introduced the policy of containment of communism, which led to the formation of NATO in 1949 and US-led UN intervention in the Korean War. He had also decided to introduce the hydrogen bomb, leading to a nuclear arms race with the USSR. The New Look foreign policy outlined by Eisenhower's Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, in January 1954 included the concept of 'rollback', of replacing Communist governments with pro-Western governments – which were usually dictatorships. Dulles also argued the need to use 'massive retaliation', involving nuclear weapons, if necessary, against the USSR. [There was a financial benefit to a greater reliance on nuclear arms because doing so was cheaper than having massive conventional forces which required large numbers of troops.]

In practice, however, these policies, also sometimes labelled 'brinkmanship', were applied only occasionally. Two examples of rollback are the CIA-supported coups against 'left-wing' governments in Iran [1953] and Guatemala [1954]. Neither was central to Soviet interests. When it came to Hungary in 1956, the USA refused to support anti-Communist rebels in their attempt to overturn their Communist government. A Communist Hungary was essential to Soviet interests. Also, Eisenhower ended the Korean War in 1953 with Korea divided between a capitalist South and a Communist North. In Southeast Asia, the USA withdrew from the Geneva conference on the future of Vietnam following the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu rather than be seen to support the partition of the country.

With National Security Paper NSC 162/2, written in October 1953, less than a year after Eisenhower became president, his administration followed Truman's policy of containment. It even followed the model of NATO, establishing SEATO in 1954 to cover Southeast Asia and supporting the British establishment of CENTO in 1955 to cover the Middle East. For all the aggressive language of John Foster Dulles, the USA used its military power more sparingly under Eisenhower than it had under Truman and then it would under Kennedy and Johnson. If anything, the accession to power of Khrushchev in the USSR led to a slight thaw in the Cold War, as shown by Khrushchev's visit to the USA in 1959.

| | | | |
|--------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 9 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 43 |

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991

Indicative Content

- 9 To what extent was the globalisation of the Cold War in the period from 1950 to 1975 caused by the USA's misinterpretation of Soviet motives? [30]**

It could be argued that the USA greatly over-estimated the threat posed by communism, in particular through the assumption that there was a monolithic communist plot with the aim of world domination. This misinterpretation led to containment, rollback and belief in the 'domino effect', which, in turn, led to American involvement in Korea, Cuba, Vietnam, the Middle East and South America, escalating regional issues into Cold War crises. In reality, there was no monolithic communist plot, the Sino-Soviet split making such a thing impossible. For example, the USSR played a far less direct role than the USA in Korea and Vietnam.

In challenging this view, it could be argued that the USA had a great deal to fear from the expansion of communism, in particular its economic interests (e.g. in SE Asia). The USSR, while not directly involved in the Korean War, had given 'permission' for the North to attack the South. Both the USSR and the PRC played significant roles in the Vietnam War, supplying the Vietcong with the weaponry necessary to eventually achieve victory. Despite Khrushchev's stated policy of 'peaceful coexistence', the USSR exploited post-colonial problems in Africa in an attempt to spread its influence and supported communist-style governments in Latin America. In Cuba, the USSR created greater tension by placing nuclear weapons close to the USA itself.

- 10 How far was Gorbachev responsible for the collapse of the Soviet Union? [30]**

In support of the view that Gorbachev was responsible, it could be argued that he made a fundamental error in trying to achieve economic and political reform at the same time through his policies of glasnost and perestroika. China survived the crisis of communism by undertaking economic reform while maintaining strict one-party control of the state. In seeking political reform, Gorbachev undermined the power and authority of the communist party. In ending the Brezhnev Doctrine, Gorbachev encouraged nationalist movements both in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union itself. As a result, the USSR disintegrated.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that Gorbachev's reforms may have hastened the collapse of the USSR, but were not the fundamental cause of it. Long term economic problems and political inertia under previous leaders meant that the USSR was in a very weak state when Gorbachev became leader. With its finances drained by the need to maintain the arms race with the USA, reliant on imports of American wheat, facing nationalist dissension and unable to sustain the financial commitment of maintaining its control of Eastern Europe, Gorbachev had little option but to seek improved relations with the West. This could only be achieved by showing a willingness to undertake political reform. Gorbachev was, therefore, seeking to address the problems which faced the USSR while, at the same time, developing improved relations with the USA.

| | | | |
|---------|--|----------|-------|
| Page 10 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015 | 9389 | 43 |

- 11 'The victory of the Chinese communists in 1949 was caused by the weaknesses of the KMT.' How far do you agree? [30]

In support of the view, it could be argued that the KMT administration was both inefficient and corrupt, much of the aid it received from the USA being kept by officials for their own personal use. The KMT's policy of printing extra money to pay for the war against the communists led to massive inflation, which caused hardship for both the lower and middle classes. The KMT forces were poorly paid and allowed to loot the countryside. The attempt to terrorise local populations into submission simply alienated people. Chiang Kai-shek was guilty of tactical errors, leading to his armies becoming scattered and vulnerable. His troops became disillusioned and either defected to the communists or, as at Beijing and Shanghai, surrendered without resistance.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that there were other reasons for the communist victory. Japanese aggression had prevented the KMT from gaining complete control of China, enabling the CCP to gain in strength under Mao. The communists were able to represent themselves as patriotic nationalists, using guerrilla tactics against the Japanese. This won the CCP large-scale support from the lower and middle classes. The CCP was able to gain a foothold in Manchuria due to Soviet assistance. The communists continued to win popular support as a result of their restrained land policy, which varied according to the needs of local areas; the CCP gained a reputation as both honest and fair, aided by Mao's skilful use of propaganda. With mass support, the CCP armies became large enough to abandon guerrilla tactics and confront the KMT forces directly. The CCP armies were also better trained and disciplined than their KMT counterparts, based on the competent and more tactically aware leadership of Lin Biao, Chu Teh and Ch-en Yi. The CCP leaders, Mao and Zhou En-lai, were shrewd enough to be able to take full advantage of the KMT's weaknesses.

- 12 'President Sadat of Egypt consistently sought peace with Israel.' How far do you agree? [30]

In support of the view, it could be argued that the Six Day War had been a humiliation for the Arab states and especially for Egypt. Although the USSR continued to supply the Arab states with modern weapons, it had not sent help during the Six Day War and its support could not be relied on. Moreover, Sadat was concerned that PLO terrorism would turn world opinion against the Palestinian cause, especially when members of the Israeli team were murdered at the 1972 Olympics in Munich. Sadat tried to get American support in the hope that they would force Israel to agree to a peace settlement. Sadat joined Syria in instigating the Yom Kippur War of 1973 with the aim of forcing the USA to act as mediators. In this he was successful, as both the USA and the USSR called for a ceasefire. Sadat realised that Israel could not be destroyed by force and became the first Arab leader to meet Israeli leaders in talks. In doing so, Sadat recognised the existence of Israel and gained the resentment of the PLO and more aggressive Arab states such as Iraq and Syria. The USA played a vital role in setting up the formal negotiations at Camp David, which led to the end of the state of war which had existed between Egypt and Israel since 1948.

In challenging the view, it could be argued that Sadat was aiming to destroy Israel by instigating the Yom Kippur War in 1973. He felt more confident of victory because the Arab armies were equipped with modern Russian weapons and had been trained by Soviet experts. Attacking on a Jewish religious festival caught the Israelis off guard and, initially, the Egyptian and Syrian forces gained some success. Subsequently, the Israelis gained the upper hand, even crossing the Suez Canal into Egypt. It was only then that Sadat realised that the Arab states would never be strong enough to defeat Israel and sought a negotiated settlement, without which, he believed, Egypt would remain vulnerable to Israeli aggression.