
HISTORY

9389/42

Paper 4 Depth Study 42

May/June 2019

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 May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **15** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**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.

| Question 1–12 | Generic Levels of Response: | Marks |
|------------------|--|--------------|
| Level 5: | <p>Responses show a 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 may 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> | 25–30 |
| Level 4: | <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> | 19–24 |
| Level 3: | <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 or conclusions. Alternatively, responses may offer an analytical approach 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> | 13–18 |
| Level 2: | <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 factual 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> | 7–12 |
| Level 1: | <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> | 1–6 |
| Level 0: | No relevant creditworthy content. | 0 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | <p>How far did the Bolshevik party change in the period from 1918 to 1924?</p> <p>The party not only performed a critical role in preparing for, but in executing the overthrow of the Provisional Government in October 1917. It was the party, under Lenin's leadership that provided a government for Russia and its underlying ideology. It was the party which 'translated' Marxism into Marxist/Leninism, which it was hoped would provide a viable system of governing Russia along genuinely socialist lines and in the best interests of the working class of Russia. It promulgated the idea of state socialism and provided endorsement of such key policies as accepting the terms of Brest-Litovsk and War Communism. It was the party newspaper, Pravda, that provided the official 'line' and it was the party which drove the propaganda machine against the Whites. It was the party's commissars who provided the ruthless backing of the Red army in the field and also enforced the grain and food collection which were the main aspects of War Communism. Without the mass support, which the party engendered, there would have been no revolution in the first place, and it would not have been able to survive, let alone form a government capable of ruling Russia. The 9th Congress in 1920 is a good example of the party producing policy under Lenin's leadership in areas which not only were vital in winning the Civil War, but which also indicated, with the electrification policy, the future direction of Russia and its industry.</p> <p>Evidence of change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It transformed from a tiny minority party to the dominant power in the USSR • It transformed from a group focussing on seizing power to exercising power • It centralised authority and largely ignored locality influence • It prioritised state needs over the wishes of workers and peasants • With the ban on factions, censorship and the use of terror, it eliminated opposition • It lost all claim to be a democratic organisation • It grew massively in size <p>Evidence against change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basic principles remained, in theory at least, unchanged • State ownership, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, state domination of the economy remained goals • It remained an identifiably Marxist party • Policies such as Brest-Litovsk, War Communism and the NEP could be justifiably seen as a means to an end. • The 12th Party Congress of 1922 did have genuine debates on policy | 30 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 2 | <p>How successfully did Mussolini manage opposition to his regime?</p> <p>It could be argued that Mussolini faced a comparatively easy task in that what little opposition there was, tended to be badly divided with little chance of support from either the mass of the population or any of the social élites. The fact that Italy, while never prosperous, managed to avoid the appalling economic extremes which affected Germany in the 1920s and early 30s may also have been a factor in the lack of dissent. Mussolini took care not to alienate any of the principal élites, such as the Church, the northern industrialists and the southern landowners. He was prepared to use physical threats when necessary, such as when he needed to get Acerbo through Parliament, but he never overdid it and totally alienated people. He was also fortunate, for example, when the Aventine critics appealed to the King against Mussolini, the King ignored them as he hated them as republicans more than he disliked Mussolini. There was an effective propaganda programme and he had control of the media. There was a reasonably competent secret police, the OVRA, but they did not arouse much antagonism. Bocchini, its head, ran a very successful informer programme which infiltrated actual and potential sources of opposition. They killed tiny numbers. The Fascist Grand Council gave the appearance of ruling with the consent of the party and the élites, but Mussolini decided policy. The Corporate State gave the appearance of supporting all sections of society. There were well publicised attempts to deal with working class demands. He clearly replaced the powerful local mayors by magistrates who reported directly to Rome, so local opposition was very limited.</p> <p>Widespread apathy helped, and there never seemed to be any alternative to him. Propaganda diverted attention away from failings and towards successes. The Communists, perhaps one of the few groups who could have opposed successfully, were hopelessly divided, widely hated, and of course virtually destroyed by Stalinist purges. The Church remained as a potential block to his ambitions in some areas such as education. Some of the more sensible ideas built in to the Corporate State had to be watered down, not just through inertia and incompetence, as Mussolini feared alienating powerful élites such as the northern manufacturers. Unlike Hitler, where the majority of the German people and administration remained supportive of the Nazi regime to the bitter end, Mussolini was deposed when he failed by institutions such as the Monarchy and the Grand Council which he could never fully control.</p> | 30 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 3 | <p>‘The benefits of Stalin’s rule to the Soviet Union outweighed the harm.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>Some reflection on what may be seen as ‘benefits’ and ‘harm’ in this context might well be the best route to the higher levels. Candidates might also consider the issue that what might be a benefit to, say, Russia’s ability to wage a modern war might not have necessarily been of real benefit in material terms to the majority of the Russian people. The fact that Russia was on the way to becoming a major world power may have been of limited importance and value to a zek in the gulags doing 25 years for no crime. Many of the possible ‘benefits’ came at great human cost.</p> <p>Possible benefits might be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The industrialisation programme – electrification • Collectivisation • Rearmament • The further integration into the USSR of many of the nationalities • A degree of equality • The reduction of social and economic divisions • Improvements in health and education • Some improvements in living standards for some of the population <p>Possible harm might be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrialisation which focussed on quantity and not quality and did huge environmental damage • Dreadful housing • Collectivisation – the death of millions – a deliberately engineered famine • The purges • Disasters like the White Sea Canal • The absence of any quality consumer goods • Frequent hunger • The rise of the ‘nomenklatura’ • The absence of the rule of law • The terror <p>Many of the above factors could equally well appear in both lists. Collectivisation, for example, with its state control of agriculture, could have brought great benefits to the Russia people. However, the Lysenko affair showed just how damaging state control could be.</p> | 30 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 4 | <p>‘During 1933–1934 Hitler established his dictatorship using lawful methods.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>The focus of the response needs to be firmly between the dates in the question. Some comment on events before, provided it is brief, is acceptable if it looks at the extent to which the Nazis had or had not utilised legal methods in the rise to power before that date. The Night of the Long Knives comes after the date given as does the death of Hindenburg.</p> <p>Certainly, the Nazis placed great emphasis on the legality of their arrival into power, and it was an important reason why there was such loyalty to the regime to the bitter end. The Nazis had been the largest single party in the Reichstag in the July 1932 elections, and although their numbers were reduced to 196 in the November 1932 election, they were still the largest single party. Hitler had refused the offer of Vice Chancellor, but on Von Papen’s suggestion, Chancellor Hindenburg offered the Chancellor’s job to Hitler as he was fully entitled to. The formation of a coalition with the Nationalists / Conservatives was also perfectly legal. Hitler then proceeded to consolidate his power and deal with opposition using Article 48, for which there was ample precedent, as well as the 1932 Act which set up special courts with fairly arbitrary powers to deal with acts of ‘political’ violence. The latter was vigorously used against Nazi opponents, and not the SA. The work of legally appointed ministers such as Goebbels and Goering, mainly working within their statutory authority, further consolidated the regime. The exclusion of the Communists following the Reichstag fire was technically legal, possibly. Although he failed to win an overall majority in the March 1933 election, he did manage to get through the Enabling Act. This was the decisive factor in establishing the dictatorship. Although initially only for four years, it abolished local jurisdictions and all other parties. It provided a firm basis for a dictatorship which lasted. The Reichstag abandoned democracy.</p> <p>The increasingly brutal SA was a major factor in creating the unrest which led to the crisis of early 1933. It was the presence of armed SA men in the Reichstag which was important in getting the Enabling Act through. Many key élites, such as the Army, the Church, the major industrialists or the academics could and perhaps should have opposed. Police and judiciary were reluctant to prosecute flagrant violations of the law. Many simply opted out. Dislike of the Communists led many to ignore, if not condone, illegality, in order to protect their own interests. The degree of intimidation in all the elections was high. The whole business of the Reichstag fire was an obvious example of blatant illegality with a veneer of legality. The best example, of course, is the Night of the Long Knives which had no trace of legality whatsoever. It was just mass murder.</p> | 30 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 5 | <p>Assess the causes of US economic growth in the 1950s.</p> <p>The period of the ‘affluent society’ is often used to describe the 1950s, and for the majority of Americans this was a prosperous decade. Consumerism played a huge role in economic growth. Both Truman and Eisenhower were in favour of the government encouraging economic growth. Much of the credit for the economic boom of the 1950s can be attributed to Eisenhower. He was able to combine low taxes, balanced budgets and public spending effectively to promote growth. One of the basic principles of the Eisenhower administration was fiscal responsibility; that is, the government has a duty to stimulate economic growth and raise productivity without benefiting any one special interest. He believed that an unbalanced budget promoted inflation, which increased domestic problems and weakened national defence. He believed in low taxes but fought tax cuts. Some Republicans had felt that Eisenhower should roll back Roosevelt’s New Deal but these reforms had been both popular and successful. Eisenhower decided to keep social security and to cover another 10 million people who had originally been omitted from the programme. He also invested federal money in the Interstate Highway System.</p> <p>The post-war baby boom led to a population increase which in turn led to increased consumer spending. There was also a growth in the housing sector. Mass demobilisation after the war resulted in a shortage of 5 million homes. The government supported the growth of the suburbs, and a partnership between the government and private industry was established. The federal government introduced policies that revolutionised home building and lending, subsidised home ownership and created the infrastructure that enabled people to live in these areas. The Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans Administration both offered low-interest loans to allow families to buy new homes. Rising income and increasing public welfare resulted in more spending and the growth of the economy.</p> <p>By the 1950s, Americans consumed a third of all the world's goods and services. Americans in the 1950s began to use and throw away. Consumerism was driven by advertising which made people want to spend more. With the massive growth in suburban populations, people needed to buy automobiles. Families of all income brackets were buying televisions at a rate of five million a year. Fashion, clothing and domestic products like washing machines were all part of the consumer boom. The middle class American family in pursuit of the American dream was investing heavily in material goods. People in the 1950s were also prepared to buy now pay later. In 1950, the Diner’s Club card, the first credit card, was introduced, followed quickly by other cards. People borrowed to buy houses, cars, appliances, and even swimming pools. Buying on credit stimulated the economy; it helped to keep people in jobs. The economy overall grew by 37% during the 1950s. At the end of the decade, the average American family had 30% more purchasing power than at the beginning. Inflation, which had wreaked havoc on the economy immediately after World War II, was minimal, in part because of Eisenhower's persistent efforts to balance the federal budget.</p> | 30 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 6 | <p>How far did the ‘silent majority’ limit the influence of the vocal minorities of the 1960s and 1970s?</p> <p>The 1960s were a period when traditional values and norms of behaviour seemed to break down. Many college-age men and women became political activists and were the driving force behind the civil rights and anti-war movements. Other young people became hippies and yippies and joined the counter-culture. Supporters of the movements questioned traditional practice and organised the fight for equal rights for all people. Rather than achieve their aims through the ballot box they resorted to more direct protest including public marches, sit-ins and rallies to attract more support. The vocal minorities did help to achieve lasting progress. The civil rights movement fought to end political, social, economic, and legal practices that discriminated against African-Americans. The student movement, composed mainly of white college students, included a movement to protest against American involvement in the Vietnam War, the women’s movement fighting for equality, the gay rights movement and the environment movement. Radical groups such as Students for a Democratic Society and the Youth International Party became involved in the election campaign and the Black Panther Party demanded fundamental social change. Despite Nixon’s electoral successes in 1968 and 1972, in some ways the liberalism of the 1960s continued. Campaigns to protect the environment continued. In 1970, Congress passed the National Environmental Policy Act and the Clean Air Act, and the Clean Water Act followed two years later. Not all of Nixon’s domestic policies were conservative; he tried to overhaul the nation’s welfare system and replace it with the Family Assistance Plan, but political conservatism defeated it.</p> <p>Nixon believed many Americans were tired of hearing about their obligation to the poor; they were also angry at liberalism, at race riots in the city and at violence on campuses. In his election campaign of 1968 he often spoke of the ‘forgotten American’, ‘the non-shouters’, ‘the non-demonstrators’; he spoke of serving those who ‘obey the law, pay their taxes, go to church, send their children to school, love their country and demand new leadership’. He won the support of the middle and working classes who felt left out of politics. When a year later Nixon outlined to the nation his plan to win the Vietnam War, he made a plea ‘to you, the great silent majority of my fellow Americans’. Nixon always insisted that black Americans were part of the silent majority, but he targeted white voters who believed that the civil rights and anti-war movements had gone too far. ‘Enough Is Enough’ was a manifesto produced by conservative groups who felt they were paying taxes to fund sit-ins and protests. Many Americans felt that they were represented by Nixon’s ‘silent majority’ concept after feeling marginalised for so long. He reduced or cut many of the social programmes of the Great Society and New Frontier, for example, the Office of Economic Opportunity which was involved in the War on Poverty. Many groups of Americans continued to fight for expanded social and political rights. In 1972, Congress approved the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the Constitution but the amendment was defeated. Such setbacks encouraged many women’s rights activists to turn away from politics altogether and Watergate further discouraged people from engaging in politics. Many turned instead to pop culture.</p> | 30 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 7 | <p>‘The dominance of the Republican Party in the 1980s was based more on ideology than on their choice of presidential candidates.’ How valid is this judgement?</p> <p>Weak opponents in both the elections of 1980 and 1984 contributed to Ronald Reagan’s success. In 1980, the Americans had become disillusioned with Jimmy Carter and this was reflected in the result. He believed this gave him a mandate to reform the USA by cutting taxes, shrinking government and strengthening defence. In the September 1980 election, inflation was 22.3%, interest rates were 11.5% and the unemployment rate was 7.5%. The poor state of the US economy turned people against Carter. Only 28% of the electorate deemed themselves to be conservative and it seemed that the electorate were motivated by the desire not to return Carter to office. The country was dissatisfied with too much government involvement. There were petrol shortages and a hostage crisis in Iran; people considered that Carter was weak. Reagan’s ability as an orator enabled him to make people believe in themselves again. People approved of his style of decisive leadership; he set a clear direction for the country. It was the first serious effort to rein in the welfare state. Under Reagan, the growth of government was slowed, taxes were reduced, the economy boomed, and the nation was at peace. The Republican ideology appealed to people in comparison to the alternative.</p> <p>In 1984, Reagan’s undoubted ability to establish a rapport with the electorate gave him an advantage over his opponent, Walter Mondale. He achieved a landslide victory winning 49 states. In his first term he had worked with both Congress and Cabinet successfully. This gained him respect and his theme of peace and prosperity attracted the popular vote. He reminded people again of the high tax rates and high inflation under the Carter administration and he made full use of his ability as a good communicator to win over the American people. He pursued an optimistic and positive campaign making the people feel good, using soundbites such as ‘your hopes are our hopes’ and ‘your destiny is our destiny’. The economy was one of the central issues in the 1984 election campaign. Reagan promised economic growth and maintained that deficits would not cause any harm. His foreign policy of peace through strength also appealed to the American people as well as the fact that the international situation had remained relatively stable. There was also a perception among the people that there was an economic upswing. Many Southern whites and Northern blue-collar workers who were often referred to as ‘Reagan Democrats’ voted for him because they held him responsible for the economic recovery and national security. His conservative economic policy, often referred to as Reaganomics, was designed to reduce the government’s influence on the economy, and the boom in the mid-1980s added to Reagan’s support. It can be argued that his success was also due to the weak performance of Mondale. In contrast to Reagan, Mondale lacked media presence. His Equal Rights Amendments proposal was unpopular in Middle America and his choice of a female Vice President, Geraldine Ferraro, proved unpopular. The Democrats were perceived as supporting the poor and minorities at the expense of the middle class. Reagan was able to attack him as a typical free-spending Democrat and asked, "Now that our country is turning around, why would we ever turn back?"</p> | 30 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 8 | <p>How far did the Eisenhower administration follow the policy of rollback to which the Republican Party had committed itself in 1952?</p> <p>The Republicans fought the 1952 presidential election pledging to roll back the advance of communism. This ‘New Look’ at foreign policy proposed the use of nuclear weapons and new technology warfare in an effort to threaten ‘massive retaliation’ and use brinkmanship against the USSR for communist advances abroad. Eisenhower appointed two rollback advocates; John Foster Dulles was appointed Secretary of State and Allen Dulles became Director of the CIA. In 1953, Eisenhower's threat of a nuclear strike broke the deadlock in the Korean truce talks. The USA was also prepared to use nuclear weapons to defend the islands of Quemoy and Matsu claimed by Taiwan in 1955 against Communist China. Iran and Guatemala are examples of the use of rollback, but arguably not to rollback communism. In 1951, a left wing Prime Minister had won the election in Iran; he nationalised the oil industry which concerned the USA as Iran shared a border with the USSR. The CIA plotted a revolution in 1953 which successfully imposed a pro-Western monarchy on Iran under the leadership of the Shah. Similarly, the USA became concerned when the President of Guatemala carried out a programme of land reform in 1950 resulting in loss of land for foreign élites. The Dulles brothers again supported a CIA operation to overthrow the government in June 1954. The CIA resorted to propaganda and misinformation to spread the threat of communism to portray these coups as the rollback of communist influence. Eisenhower used the CIA to tackle the prospect of communism in developing countries outside the Soviet Union’s immediate sphere of influence. CIA operatives were assigned to Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East to ensure support for pro-American regimes.</p> <p>However, in 1953 Eisenhower held a policy review of rollback versus containment; the Solarium Study found that implementing rollback would potentially cause World War III. It confirmed the use of containment to resist Soviet aggression and domination of countries outside its sphere, but it would not interfere with Soviet internal political and economic structures. Foreign policy was also shaped by the domino theory: if one country in a region fell to communism, the other countries in that area would quickly follow. This theory was a response to events in Indochina and fear that the Communists would gain control of the entire country. SEATO was created to prevent the spread of communism in SE Asia. In 1957, he also announced the Eisenhower Doctrine, stating that the US would provide military and economic assistance to Middle Eastern countries in resisting Communist insurgents. Eisenhower also tried to improve relations with the USSR. A summit conference held in Geneva in 1955 achieved little but did lessen tension. However, the Soviet repression of the Hungarian uprising of 1956 and the launch of Sputnik 1 when the Americans feared that the USSR was capable of launching long-range nuclear missiles negated this. A further summit was held between Khrushchev and Eisenhower in 1959 followed by a summit conference in Paris which ended abruptly when the Soviets shot down an American U2 spy plane. Eisenhower and Khrushchev also made verbal threats over the future of Cuba once Fidel Castro had seized power.</p> | 30 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 9 | <p>Assess the impact of the nuclear arms race on the conduct of the Cold War in the period from 1950 to 1963.</p> <p>The dangers inherent in the use of nuclear weapons clearly had an impact on the nature of military strategy. The fear of initiating nuclear war restrained both the USA and the USSR from engaging in direct armed confrontation (as demonstrated by the Cuban missile crisis in 1962). Accordingly, other strategies had to be deployed. This led to the notion of ‘limited war’, i.e. keeping wars localised and avoiding escalation, a key factor in the globalisation of the Cold War. Prior to 1962, American nuclear strategy consisted of ‘massive retaliation’ – the threat of using nuclear weapons in retaliation to communist aggression. This, it was assumed, would act as a deterrent at a time when the USA still had nuclear supremacy. This, in turn, led to the kind of brinkmanship displayed by Kennedy over the Cuban crisis. After 1962, MAD (mutually assured destruction) led to the development of smaller, targeted nuclear weapons and to an increase in the development of conventional weapons. This provided an alternative to nuclear war, a strategy which Kennedy dubbed ‘flexible response’. Whilst nuclear weapons were not used during the Cold War, they formed a significant part of the conflict. The arms race was an integral part of the struggle for supremacy, a measure of technological superiority which both sides saw as central to highlighting the pre-eminence of their politico-economic systems. Subsequent attempts to control the proliferation and development of nuclear weapons, whilst of limited success, could be seen as vital in bringing the USA and the USSR together, at least during periods of detente.</p> | 30 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 10 | <p>‘National uprisings in Eastern Europe were a consequence, rather than a cause, of the decline of the Soviet Union in the 1980s.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>The main reason for the disintegration of the USSR was long-term economic stagnation, together with political inertia under elderly and ineffective leaders. Moreover, the hard line adopted by Ronald Reagan and the West, together with an enhancement of the USA’s nuclear programme which the USSR was economically unable to counter, encouraged Gorbachev to seek improved relations with the West. In a desperate attempt to address these problems, Gorbachev instituted a series of reforms, in particular glasnost and perestroika. In providing extra freedoms, these reforms encouraged latent nationalist movements, both in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union itself, while also contributing to political upheaval within the Communist Party. Gorbachev’s abandonment of the Brezhnev Doctrine, primarily for reasons of economic necessity, gave added impetus to the nationalist uprisings in Eastern Europe, enabling them to develop largely unchallenged.</p> <p>Nationalist uprisings in Eastern Europe were largely due to increasing exposure to Western culture, technology and propaganda. Eastern Europeans were able to compare their own economically disadvantaged situation with the prosperity of Western Europe. The speed with which changes occurred throughout Eastern Europe following the success of Solidarity in Poland in 1988 was the key factor in hastening the collapse of the USSR. Communist governments were quickly removed in Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania. This encouraged nationalist uprisings within the Soviet Union itself (for example, Nagarno-Karabatch, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia). The USSR’s inability to respond decisively and effectively led to political dissensions within the Communist Party, and it was these which led to the disintegration of the Soviet Union.</p> | 30 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 11 | <p>Should Deng Xiaoping be seen more as a reformer than a hardliner?</p> <p>Evidence of Deng Xiaoping as a reformer: Deng himself claimed that ‘reform is China’s second revolution’. He argued that ‘socialism is not incompatible with a market economy’. In line with this, he ended Mao’s rigid adherence to Marxist-Leninist principles and instituted major economic reforms, moving China towards ‘market socialism’. As a result, the CCP withdrew from administrative tasks and allowed greater initiative at lower levels. His aim was to make China a prosperous and modernised state, and he appreciated that this could only be achieved with capitalist-type investment. Under Deng, China sought financial assistance from the West and, in 1980, joined the IMF and the World Bank. His statement that ‘to get rich is not a crime’ highlights his willingness to move away from Mao’s beliefs.</p> <p>Evidence of Deng Xiaoping as a hardliner: While Deng allowed some economic reform, he was not prepared to allow any political reform. He believed that China could only become a modernised state if it retained the one-party system. Unlike Gorbachev, who believed that economic reform could not achieve success without simultaneous political reform, Deng insisted on retaining the power of the CCP. ‘Without the Party’, he argued, ‘China will regress into divisions and confusions.’ The experience of the Democracy Wall had alerted him to the dangers involved in allowing too much political freedom. Confronted with mass demonstrations in support of greater reform during the 1980s, Deng was prepared to use the army to put down opposition, despite the international condemnation which this caused.</p> <p>Deng was, therefore, both a reformer and a hardliner. Indeed, he had to be in order to maintain his own control within the CCP. He had to perform a careful balancing act between the traditional, conservative and Maoist right wingers (for example, Li Peng) and those on the left wing who wanted more reform (for example, Zhao Ziyang). Hence, he supported Zhao Ziyang (an economic reformer) over economic issues, yet backed the hardliner Li Peng in his decision to use troops to disperse protesters.</p> | 30 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 12 | <p>‘The Suez crisis of 1956 was caused by Western fears regarding Egypt’s increasingly close relations with the Soviet Union.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>In September 1955, Nasser signed an arms deal with Czechoslovakia, providing Egypt with Russian planes, tanks and military advisors. This outraged the USA, since it meant that the West no longer controlled arms supplies to Egypt. The USA saw this as an attempt by the USSR to gain influence in the Middle East, thereby destabilising the Cold War. In response, the USA cancelled a grant of 46 million dollars which had been promised to Egypt to help finance the Aswan Dam. It was this which prompted Nasser to nationalise the Suez Canal. Eden, the British Prime Minister, believed that Nasser wanted to form a united Arabia under Egyptian control and with communist influence. This would seriously undermine British and French interests in the Middle East, including control over the Suez Canal and threatening oil supplies. In both countries, Nasser was depicted as a Hitler/Stalin-like dictator who should not be appeased. With encouragement from the USA, Britain, France and Israel hatched a plan to invade Egypt, regain control of the Suez Canal and topple Nasser from power.</p> <p>The main cause of the crisis was the threat which Nasser posed to Anglo-French imperialist interests in the Middle East and to Israel’s security. Britain was incensed by Nasser’s refusal in 1956 to renew the agreement (1936) allowing British troops in Suez and by his encouragement of other Arab leaders to oppose the British sponsored Baghdad Pact. Nasser angered the French by sending support to Algerian Arabs in their struggle against France. Aggressively in favour of Arab unity and independence, including the liberation of Palestine from Jewish control, Nasser organised guerrilla fighters (Fedayeen) to carry out terrorist activities inside Israel. The nationalisation of the Suez Canal angered both Britain and France. Together with Israel, they hatched a plot designed to regain control of the canal and topple Nasser from power. The plan was initially successful, but an international outcry forced Britain, France and Israel to withdraw. The USA, concerned that the attack would encourage Arab states to forge closer links with the USSR, condemned the use of force.</p> | 30 |