
HISTORY

9389/12

Paper 1 Document Question

October/November 2018

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

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 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **13** 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.

PUBLISHED

Part(a)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 4:	Makes a developed comparison Makes a developed comparison between the two sources, recognising points of similarity and difference. Uses knowledge to evaluate the sources and shows good contextual awareness.	12–15
Level 3:	Compares views and identifies similarities and differences Compares the views expressed in the sources, identifying differences and similarities. Begins to explain and evaluate the views using the sources and knowledge.	8–11
Level 2:	Compares views and identifies similarities and/or differences Identifies relevant similarities or differences between views/sources and the response may be one-sided with only one aspect explained. Alternatively, both similarities and differences may be mentioned but both aspects lack development.	4–7
Level 1:	Describes content of each source Describes or paraphrases the content of the two sources. Very simple comparisons may be made (e.g. one is from a letter and the other is from a speech) but these are not developed.	1–3
Level 0:	No relevant comment on the sources or the issue	0

PUBLISHED

Part(b)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
Level 5:	Evaluates the sources to reach a sustained judgement Answers are well focused, demonstrating a clear understanding of the sources and the question. Reaches a sustained judgement about the extent to which the sources support the statement and weighs the evidence in order to do this.	21–25
Level 4:	Evaluates the sources Demonstrates a clear understanding of the sources and the question. Begins to evaluate the material in context, considering the nature, origin and purpose of the sources in relation to the statement. At the top of this level candidates may begin to reach a judgement but this is not sustained.	16–20
Level 3:	Uses the sources to support and challenge the statement Makes valid points from the sources to both challenge and support the statement in the question. These comments may be derived from source content or may be about the provenance/nature of the sources.	11–15
Level 2:	Uses the sources to support or challenge the statement Makes valid points from the sources to either support the statement in the question or to challenge it. These comments may be derived from source content or may be about the provenance/nature of the sources.	6–10
Level 1:	Does not make valid use of the sources Describes the content of the sources with little attempt to link the material to the question. Alternatively, candidates may write an essay about the question without reference to the sources.	1–5
Level 0:	No relevant comment on the sources or the issue	0

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>To what extent do Sources A and C agree on the impact of the Congress of Vienna on Italy?</p> <p>Source A, written by the official spokesman for Piedmont to one of the authors of Vienna, might be expected to have an anti-Austrian viewpoint. The source stresses that Vienna had a huge impact as the French had done a lot for the language and army in Italy, developed the idea of careers open to talent and encouraged 'Italian' ideas in other ways. Now the Austrians had taken over the best parts of Italy, reversed the benefits of French rule, dominated other areas such as Parma and returned the Papal States to its 'enslaving' ruler.</p> <p>Source B, while still critical, does see it as a 'great' treaty. It suggests that it is not the treaty that is the problem, but the way in which it is administered by the sovereign princes and the Church. It suggests that the ideas the French had brought in were not destroyed. It suggests also that the basic principle behind the Treaty, of restraining the French, was not in itself a bad idea. Austria in charge of the north of Italy was not necessarily a bad thing, but Austria in the care of Metternich, was. The author, a Frenchman living in Milan, writing when the impact of Vienna might really be being felt in Italy, demonstrates his pro-Italian viewpoint.</p>	15

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>'It was Austria that prevented Italian unity after 1815.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?</p> <p>Source A largely supports the hypothesis. It reveals how the Austrians were largely 'given' parts of Northern Italy, and Austria dominated some of the minor states such as Parma. However, it does suggest that the Pope, and those who did not 'speak for Italy' at Vienna, were also partly to blame.</p> <p><i>This is a formal document, pleading for reconsideration of the 'Italy' case by one of the principal authors of the Vienna settlement. It is one-sided and is arguing a case, as that is what an ambassador was expected to do. It would not be intended for publication and therefore would naturally be critical of Austria and other obstacles to unification such as the Papacy.</i></p> <p>Source B is very much supporting the hypothesis. It shows the extent to which the Austrians were prepared to go to ensure there was no opposition to its domination of Italy. The fact that they were prepared to prevent those who 'might be' thinking liberal or nationalist policies, let alone were actually doing it, shows the strength of their opposition. They were also looking to developing espionage systems in other countries as well.</p> <p><i>These secret orders would not be intended for publication. The fact that they were labelled 'Secret' would emphasise their validity. These orders give a very clear and reliable picture of Austria's policies towards Italy and how it viewed Italian aspirations for independence and unity.</i></p> <p>Source C can be used on either side of the argument. It does place some blame on Vienna but suggests that Italians must take much of the blame. It was 'the Church, the aristocracy and the sovereign princes of Italy' who should take responsibility. The writer was not opposed so much to the ideas behind Vienna, but was more critical of the men who were put in power after it. The obstacle was the men, not the Treaty.</p> <p><i>Source C is written by a well-known writer who takes quite a balanced and objective view. He does consider all the major obstacles to unity in quite a balanced way, and sees Austria as only part of the problem. From a diary, not necessarily designed for publication, it is a very useful source as he is not arguing a case or defending a position.</i></p> <p>Source D, while seeing Austria as part of the problem, places the blame very firmly elsewhere and therefore challenges the hypothesis. The source states that Charles Albert, ruler of Piedmont and Sardinia, was seen as responsible for the failure of the first attempt to oust the Austrians in the 1820s, although what happened in Naples was also a factor. Like the author of Source C, he sees Italian failings as well, with the aristocracy, the propertied and army officers being responsible as well.</p>	25

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<i>Source D is a private letter from someone who participated in the first attempt to oust the Austrians. As an eyewitness and participant the source is a useful one, but possibly one sided and coming from a very narrow perspective. As the attempt failed, it would be natural for him to look for someone to blame, but he does give, in the light of contextual knowledge, a fairly clear picture of why the attempt failed.</i>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p>To what extent do Sources C and D agree on the impact of President Lincoln’s inaugural address?</p> <p>Similarities include: Both see the speech as having limited impact, if for different reasons. Source C sees it as accepting the secession moves of the South; Lincoln’s threats are seen as bluff. Source D sees it as merely adding smoke to the fog surrounding the topic of war.</p> <p>Differences include: Source C welcomes the speech as a positive move towards maintaining peace, as evidence of realism in the White House. It implies that the likelihood of civil war had receded. Source D dismisses the speech as something of an irrelevance. The issue of peace and war would be decided by Lincoln’s response to representatives from the South.</p> <p><i>Both sources are from very contemporary newspaper reports, Source C from a Southern state, Source D from a Northern. Source C is surprisingly positive in its attitude towards the inaugural speech of a Republican president, though it argues thus because the speech helps show the success of the Southern strategy. Source D is surprisingly lukewarm towards the address of a Republican president elected by the North. Contextual knowledge of Lincoln as well as Source B suggests that Source C had misinterpreted Lincoln’s inaugural address while Source D is more reliable because it makes no great claims on behalf of either Lincoln or the North.</i></p>	15

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p>How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that Abraham Lincoln was responsible for the outbreak of the civil war in 1861?</p> <p>Sources B and C challenge the assertion. Source B is from Lincoln himself, from a key public speech, in which he is likely to show himself as working for peace, not war. If he does have to order the use of force, the article says, it would be in defence of a Union which others are trying to destroy. Dismissing Lincoln's threats to use force as bluff, Source C describes Lincoln's inaugural address as 'a peace-keeping document'.</p> <p><i>Source B is a public speech by Lincoln himself. It was the first speech of a new President who, uniquely, faced a rebellion by seven states which, since he had been elected five months previously, had declared their independence. Lincoln had to bring these back into the Union and at the same time prevent more states breaking away, a conflict of tasks which required great skill and dexterity to manage properly. He had to be firm in his dealings with the seven and yet conciliatory towards the potential rebels. Hence the line he took in Source B. Some might argue that, because it is a public speech, Source B is unreliable. This speech can be seen as an exception to that general rule. The extract is a clear, unemotional statement of Lincoln's position as US president faced with rebellion and determined to defeat it. Contextual knowledge, most especially the confrontation over Fort Sumter, confirms Lincoln's inaugural declaration.</i></p> <p><i>Source C is very different. It is a Southern newspaper source. At the time of the article, Virginia had not yet decided whether to secede. It did so in April 1861, after the conflict over Fort Sumter. [Part of Virginia refused to secede, eventually forming the state of West Virginia.] The article argues that it was secession which made Lincoln a peace-maker. This is to claim too much for secession. The article argues such presumably in the hope that it will influence the secession debate within the state. Thus it is pleading a special case, which makes it unreliable in terms of Lincoln's responsibility for war.</i></p> <p>In support of the assertion, Source D argues that whether the USA would experience war or peace depended on Lincoln and his response to the demands of a team of Southern politicians. Thus Lincoln would be ultimately responsible for the start of war. The fourth source, Source A, also sees Lincoln as responsible for causing the war. Asserting that the question of war or peace was in Lincoln's hands and hoping for peace, the author left a meeting with Lincoln depressed by his hard-line stance.</p>	25

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><i>Source A was from a border slave state which was so divided that in the summer of 1861 it declared its neutrality from the conflict. The extract is factual reportage rather than editorial opinion. It describes a recent meeting between a ‘respectable’ Kentucky citizen and Abraham Lincoln before the latter left Illinois for Washington DC. Lincoln is quoted verbatim, which is possible, especially given that Hutchinson was shocked by Lincoln’s hard line and the meeting was held ‘a few days ago’. Much could be made of the significance of ‘recapture’ as Lincoln applied the term to the Southern forts, such as Fort Sumter. It implies that the South has captured these forts, in other words that Lincoln would act only to uphold the status quo. This can be supported by cross-reference to Source B.</i></p> <p><i>Source D, arguing that final responsibility would rest with Lincoln, is from a New York newspaper. It makes no mention that the Commissioners from the South might also be responsible in making demands which Lincoln was bound to reject. This stance plus the newspaper’s criticism of Lincoln’s inaugural address, is surprising to read in a Northern source. Perhaps the commercial links between New York and the South affected the views of the New York Herald. Its criticism of the speech as confusing is not supported by Source B. Thus context and cross-referencing undermine the reliability of Source D.</i></p>	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p>Compare and contrast Sources B and D as evidence of the German people’s opinions about, and expectations of, the League of Nations.</p> <p>Differences include:</p> <p>The British journalist (Source B) states that the Germany people had always <i>‘mistrusted and hated’</i> the League of Nations. It claims that the German people associated the League with the Treaty of Versailles, which, in Germany, was perceived as unfair and unjust – a treaty which was imposed on Germany, whose representatives were not even allowed to attend the Paris Peace Conference which determined and dictated its terms.</p> <p>Hitler (Source D) claims that, at the end of the First World War, the German people were totally in favour of the establishment of the League of Nations. He goes as far as suggesting that Germany supported the concept of a League more than any other country. He suggests that they supported the League because it seemed to offer the best way of avoiding such a war in the future by <i>‘restructuring relations between nations’</i>.</p> <p>Similarities include:</p> <p>Both Sources agree that the League’s failure to secure international disarmament was a fundamental reason for the German people’s resentment towards it. Germany had complied with its obligations to disarm, but no other country had. This put Germany in a <i>‘position of inferiority’</i> [Source B] and <i>‘completely at the mercy’</i> of threats from other nations [Source D].</p> <p><i>The British journalist (Source B) is trying to understand and explain the reasons behind Germany’s decision to leave the League of Nations, a decision announced two days previously. It is endeavouring to be objective, looking at the situation from the German point of view. The report does not reflect the opinions of the British government, which viewed Germany’s withdrawal from the League with considerable concern, fearing that it would lead to massive German rearmament.</i></p> <p><i>In Source D, Hitler is being considerably less objective. Some 18 months after the event, he is seeking to justify his decision to withdraw from the League of Nations to a German people who were not universally supportive of the Nazi Party’s control over Germany, amidst economic problems and growing concerns that the country was internationally isolated and heading for another war. At the same time, he is seeking to assure other nations that Nazi Germany desires (and has always desired) peace. He is appealing to the German people’s nationalistic sentiments. His argument that it was unfair for other nations to insist on German disarmament but then fail to carry out their own obligations to do likewise is both understandable and justified.</i></p>	15

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p>‘Germany withdrew from the League of Nations because of its failure to secure international disarmament.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view?</p> <p>Source A states that Germany’s decision to withdraw from the League of Nations coincided with its decision to leave the World Disarmament Conference, and therefore supports the statement. It reports that at the Conference Germany argued that either other nations should carry out their commitment to disarm in line with the disarmament imposed upon Germany in 1919, or Germany should be allowed to re-arm in line with the military capabilities of other countries. It was the rejection of this argument by France, Britain and the USA which led to Germany’s withdrawal from the League.</p> <p><i>Source A is an objective report by a journalist, written on the day when Germany announced its decision to leave the League. It is descriptive and does not attempt to draw conclusions or give opinions, with the exception of the statement that ‘marchers formed into ranks familiar in the World War’, which hints that Germany may be adopting a militaristic stance threatening a future war. Apart from this statement, there is no reason to suspect that the source may be unreliable.</i></p> <p>Source B both challenges and supports the statement. In support, it argues that it was the League’s failure to further international disarmament which was the main reason for Germany’s withdrawal. Germany felt both vulnerable and humiliated as a result of other nations’ refusal to honour their disarmament commitments. However, Source B implies that there were other, more deep-rooted reasons for Germany’s decision to leave the League; so can also be used to challenge the statement. In particular, Germany associated the League with the unfair and hated Treaty of Versailles. The War Guilt Clause and the loss of German-speaking people to other nations caused enormous resentment in Germany, where the League was perceived as merely a vehicle for ensuring compliance with the Treaty of Versailles, maintaining the power of the victorious World War I Allies over the defeated Germany.</p> <p><i>Source B – Written two days after the announcement, this report by a British journalist in Berlin attempts to explain Germany’s decision to leave the League from the perspective of the German people. Unlike Source A, this report is not descriptive; it is the opinion of the writer, based on his experience of living in Berlin. In other major countries, and particularly France, Germany’s decision to leave the League would have been seen as unreasonable and likely to lead to an arms race and the threat of future war. The writer is attempting to show that, from the German point of view, there were logical and deep-rooted reasons for leaving the League, not least resentment against what the German people considered a totally unfair Treaty of Versailles.</i></p> <p>In Source D, Hitler claims that the League’s failure to ensure fair and equal international disarmament was the only reason why Germany decided to withdraw from a League which it had welcomed and supported throughout. Thus, this source supports the statement.</p>	25

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><i>Source D – [Note – under League rules, a country would remain a member for two years following its announcement that it intended to withdraw. This source was published before Germany’s final exit from the League]. Some 18 months after the announcement of Germany’s withdrawal from the League, Hitler is attempting to justify the decision to the German people, aware that his words would also be seen and analysed in other countries. By March 1935, there was still much domestic opposition to Hitler’s Nazi government, together with international fears that Germany was preparing for war. Hitler is seeking to enhance his government’s domestic popularity, while also demonstrating his government’s peaceful intentions, by showing the logic behind the decision to leave the League. The source is unreliable as evidence of the real reasons for Germany’s decision to leave the League. It manipulates the truth (e.g. suggesting that Germany only agreed to the Treaty of Versailles because of its support for the League of Nations) and uses emotive language (e.g. ‘surrounded by highly armed nations of war’).</i></p> <p>Source C challenges the hypothesis as it suggests that there were domestic reasons for Hitler’s decision to withdraw Germany from the League. Hitler had only recently come to power, and the position of the Nazi Party was not yet secure. Amidst on-going economic problems, the popularity of the Nazi Party was under threat. The decision to leave the League of Nations would be a popular move in Germany, uniting the German people by appealing to nationalistic sentiments based on their hatred of the Treaty of Versailles. This would deflect attention away from domestic problems, enhance Hitler’s reputation and reinforce the Nazi Party’s control over Germany.</p> <p><i>Source C is a confidential diplomatic report. It suggests that Hitler had ulterior motives for withdrawing Germany from the League – a propaganda move to enhance his government’s declining popularity in Germany. The source is, therefore, the informed opinion of an experienced American diplomat living in Germany.</i></p>	