



## Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

HISTORY

9389/13

Paper 1 Document Question

October/November 2021

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

---

This document consists of **11** 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>Part(a)</b>  | <b>Generic Levels of Response:</b>   | <b>Marks</b> |
|-----------------|--|--------------|
| <b>Level 4:</b> | <b>Makes a developed comparison</b><br>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.  | <b>12–15</b> |
| <b>Level 3:</b> | <b>Compares views and identifies similarities and differences</b><br>Compares the views expressed in the sources, identifying differences and similarities. Begins to explain and evaluate the views using the sources and knowledge.  | <b>8–11</b>  |
| <b>Level 2:</b> | <b>Compares views and identifies similarities and/or differences</b><br>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. | <b>4–7</b>   |
| <b>Level 1:</b> | <b>Describes content of each source</b><br>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.  | <b>1–3</b>   |
| <b>Level 0:</b> | <b>No relevant comment on the sources or the issue</b>   | <b>0</b>     |

| <b>Part(b)</b>  | <b>Generic Levels of Response:</b>  | <b>Marks</b> |
|-----------------|---|--------------|
| <b>Level 5:</b> | <b>Evaluates the sources to reach a sustained judgement</b><br>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.                                  | <b>21–25</b> |
| <b>Level 4:</b> | <b>Evaluates the sources</b><br>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. | <b>16–20</b> |
| <b>Level 3:</b> | <b>Uses the sources to support and challenge the statement</b><br>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.  | <b>11–15</b> |
| <b>Level 2:</b> | <b>Uses the sources to support or challenge the statement</b><br>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.  | <b>6–10</b>  |
| <b>Level 1:</b> | <b>Does not make valid use of the sources</b><br>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.   | <b>1–5</b>   |
| <b>Level 0:</b> | <b>No relevant comment on the sources or the issue</b>  | <b>0</b>     |

| Question | Answer  | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 1(a)     | <p><b>How far do Sources C and D agree about the role of the House of Representatives?</b></p> <p><b>Agree:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Sources agree that the House of Representatives have a major role to play when it comes to granting the money which the Government needs, for example, to pay for its army. Even in exceptional circumstances the House has to be involved, although this is implicit in <b>Source D</b>.</li> <li>• <b>Source C</b> makes it clear that the House has a right to criticise the Government and that is implicit in <b>Source D</b> as well.</li> <li>• Both sources make it clear that the Budget issue is not just a simple clash over money, but part of a much wider constitutional issue.</li> </ul> <p><b>Disagree:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While there is agreement in the sources that the House has a role in the Budget, there is serious disagreement about the nature and extent of that role. <b>Source C</b> suggests that the House has a veto under the Constitution in all money matters, and <b>Source D</b> makes it clear that it does not. If there is disagreement, suggests <b>Source D</b>, then the House does not have a veto, but there has to be a compromise between the parties involved.</li> <li>• <b>Source C</b> argues that simply because money was allocated to the army one year in the Budget, does not mean that it automatically will be allocated the following year. This is evidently not accepted in <b>Source D</b>.</li> </ul> <p><i><b>Source C</b> is a one-sided view, coming from a group in one of the Houses of Parliament. How far it represented the views of all Parliament let alone the country as a whole, is not clear. Contextual knowledge would suggest that there was a growing demand for democracy in Germany at the time, and these views were symptomatic of them. In <b>Source D</b> Bismarck is arguing in favour of his master, the King, and Bismarck was known for his hostility to democratic processes. However, he does try to appear balanced, in that he argues that the cause is over the interpretation of the Constitution and is not too confrontational. Offending the House of Representatives permanently could make life difficult for both himself and his master, the King.</i></p> | 15    |

| Question | Answer  | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 1(b)     | <p><b>'The King and his ministers were responsible for the constitutional crisis of 1862–1863.'</b> How far do Sources A to D support this view?</p> <p><b>Source A</b> makes it clear that it is the King who is to blame for the crisis. The reference to manipulating elections to get a better result also suggests this. It is very clear that the King is trying to resist the 'invasion of democracy' and is quite prepared to go to extreme measures if needed. There is a mention of a possible 'coup d'état' and trying to avoid violating the Constitution 'as a whole'. While possibly approving of the actions of the King of Prussia, the Ambassador makes it very clear that the King is responsible for the crisis.</p> <p><i>The Austrian is a detached and probably well-informed observer of events in Prussia. There would be no need for him to do anything other than just tell his superior in Vienna exactly what he saw was happening. Contextual knowledge would of course suggest that he was pretty accurate in his comments. There was a genuine desire on the part of the Prussian government to retain as much autocracy as possible. The King was never a supporter of democracy.</i></p> <p><b>Source B</b> on the whole <b>does not support</b> the hypothesis. It places the blame firmly on the House of Representatives who are withholding the money which the government feels it must have for the country's security. The government is prepared to allow the House to spend a lot of time debating the issue, but the House disallowing vitally needed money for the army is felt to be the main cause of the crisis.</p> <p>Could also be <b>support</b>: However, in the final sentences of the Source it is implicit that this is a result of the Government's interpretation of the constitution.</p> <p><i>This account clearly represents the point of view of a government, angry that it has not got the money that it feels that it needs to maintain the national interest. Naturally, it is the one-sided view of a government which has not accepted that democracy might have arrived in Prussia and is looking for a way to get what it needs against the wishes of the representatives of the people. The government was very anxious to get the money for its 'reforms', particularly the extension of compulsory military service for all men, which entailed considerable costs.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> places the blame for causing the crisis firmly on the government, arguing that the government is endangering the right of the House to determine the budget in advance. It argues that the House has a veto and the government is violating the constitution. Again, part of the problem seems to be that a lack of clarity in the Constitution might be the issue, or possibly just a one-sided interpretation of it.</p> <p><i>Again, this is a one-sided view, coming from a group in one of the Houses of Parliament. How far it represented the views of all Parliament let alone the country as a whole, is not clear. Contextual knowledge would suggest that there was a growing demand for democracy in Germany at the time, and these views were symptomatic of them.</i></p> | 25    |

| Question | Answer  | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 1(b)     | <p><b>Source D</b>, a speech by Bismarck, places the blame for causing the crisis primarily on the House of Representatives. This was to be expected from a member of the Government. However, he suggests that it is not a conflict between the Government and the House, but between the House and the Crown for domination of the whole country. However, he makes it much clearer than either <b>Sources B or C</b>, that there was a lack of clarity in the Constitution as to what should happen in a disagreement between the various parts of the Constitution. He argues that what the House is asking for is unconstitutional, and therefore is responsible for the crisis. He suggests that the Constitution indicates that there should be a compromise in case of a disagreement, obviously one which favoured the government which he was a leading member of.</p> <p><i>Naturally, Bismarck is arguing in favour of his master, the King, and Bismarck was known for his hostility to democratic processes. However, he does try to appear balanced, in that he argues that the cause is over the interpretation of the Constitution and is not too confrontational. Offending the House of Representatives permanently could make life difficult for both himself and his master, the King.</i></p> |       |

| Question | Answer   | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 2(a)     | <p><b>Compare and contrast Sources A and C as explanations of Northern attitudes towards the admission of California</b></p> <p><b>Similarities</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both agree</b> that the Northern attitudes were those of self-interest. <b>Source A</b>, a Northern source: ‘California brings gold and trade’ vs. <b>Source C</b>, a Southern source: ‘California seeks greater power over the South’.</li> <li>• Both agree that the North wanted California to join the USA, largely because it would become a free state.</li> <li>• Both agree that California will be a free trade state.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source A</b> identifies two motives for the North to support the admission of California: liberty and wealth whereas <b>Source C</b> identifies just one motive: to attack the South.</li> <li>• The motives themselves are different: economic in <b>Source A</b>, political in <b>Source C</b>.</li> <li>• <b>Source A</b> says the North is willing to compromise concerning the admission of California whereas <b>Source C</b> says the North is unwilling to compromise.</li> </ul> <p><i><b>Source A</b> is from a speech to the US Senate by a Northern Senator while <b>Source C</b> is a newspaper report of a speech to the US Senate by a Southern Senator. AS evidence of Northern attitudes, <b>Source A</b> is the more useful. However, as a public speech by a politician, it is inherently unreliable, especially give its florid language.</i></p> | 15    |

| Question | Answer   | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 2(b)     | <p><b>'Bringing California into the Union divided the country.'</b> How far do Sources A to D support this view?</p> <p><b>Source A challenges</b> the assertion. It argues that the bringing California into the Union was part of a Compromise from which both sections gained. On one side, California would join as a free state. On the other free states such as New York conceded certain rights to Southern slaveholders.</p> <p><i>Source A is a public statement for the admission of California which places it in its wider political context. In general terms, as a public speech by a politician, it is likely to be unreliable. Once stripped of its flowery language, however, it is a fairly accurate summary of the reality of the Compromise of 1850. As such, it is more reliable than might be expected.</i></p> <p><b>Source B also challenges</b> the hypothesis in that it argues that the proposal to include California was 'at once received with favour by a large proportion of the country'. The source goes on to say that Congress has delayed the passage of the bill but provides no further evidence. Delay in Congress is not linked with divisions in the country; it is merely about deciding the best way of carrying out President Taylor's wish to include California in the Union.</p> <p><i>This Missouri newspaper provides an overview of the process of admitting California which is reasonably positive. It is certainly more positive than Source C, another Southern source. The weakness of the source is that its assessment of popular support for the bill is based on no specific evidence whatsoever. However, the source does detail delay in Congress, which suggests that some representatives have reservations about the process of including California. Source C gives more detail about Congressional opposition, showing it to be about more than process. Therefore, Source B is an unreliable witness in assessing support for the admission of California.</i></p> <p><b>Source C supports the hypothesis.</b> It says that Northern support for admitting California was based solely on a desire to attack the South. Including California in the Union would 'overthrow the balance of power', presumably between North and South. Standing 'on the verge of history' must mean more than just including California in the Union. It must mean risking the very unity of the USA.</p> <p><i>Source C is a Southern source which selects arguments without any supporting evidence to make its very specific case against the North. It explains Northern support for admitting California on just one factor: desire to dominate the Union at the expense of the South. It then makes alarmist claims about the sectional balance of power and the future of the USA. These claims are to some extent supported by Source D. These claims do not outweigh the interpretation of Northern motives. Source A undermines that interpretation. In answering the question, Source C is unreliable</i></p> | 25    |



| Question | Answer   | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 2(b)     | <p><b>Source D both supports and challenges the hypothesis.</b> It <b>supports</b> the hypothesis by explaining how the <b>process</b> of ‘bringing California into the Union’ divided Congress – and, by implication, US citizens. <b>It challenges</b> the hypothesis by arguing that now that the process was complete and California had joined the USA, the country will become united once more. The latter is the main message</p> <p><i>Source D is another public speech by a politician, aiming to influence listeners and readers to be positive about the inclusion of California into the USA. As such, it lacks reliability. Source C provides some support for its claim about the divisive process involved in California joining the USA, therefore giving its assessment of bringing California into the Union some credibility.</i></p> <p><i>Three of the four sources – B, C and D – mention divisions within Congress over the passing of the Bill to admit California. Only one source – Source B – mentions public opinion – and unconvincingly. Thus ‘bringing California into the Union’ divided Congress, if not necessarily the country.</i></p> |       |

| Question | Answer   | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 3(a)     | <p><b>Compare and contrast Sources A and C as evidence of opinions about the League of Nations?</b></p> <p><b>Differences include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source A</b> is more negative about the League, while <b>Source C</b> is more positive saying that it stands for peace and justice.</li> <li>• <b>Source A</b>, a French reaction, does not show much support for the League. In particular it is worried about its lack of armed forces. The author clearly does not think the League will be able to protect France against any future threat from Germany. <b>Source C</b>, by an American, does show some evidence of a positive welcome. Although the author has his own reservations, he admits that the League does have popular support, for example it represents hope to French peasants, and it does stand for peace and international justice.</li> <li>• <b>Both sources</b> have concerns about the League but they are of a different nature. <b>Source A</b> worries about the lack of armed forces while <b>Source C</b> is concerned about the dominance of the Council and the national selfishness of the major powers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sources show some agreement that the League was a good idea with some reservations.</li> <li>• <b>Source A</b> implies that the author is disappointed with the details of what was basically a good idea. He wants Wilson to look at the details again so it can be improved but is not dismissing the basic idea. <b>Source C</b> argues that it has popular support and so was welcomed by many people but has reservations especially about the role of the Council.</li> </ul> <p><i><b>Source A</b> is evidence of a French reaction and reflects the French concern about future protection from Germany. It shows evidence of French disappointment that the League will not provide this protection. Its reaction to the League is purely from a French point of view. <b>Source C's</b> reaction is evidence of an American viewpoint and shows US scepticism about whether Europeans will be able to make it work.</i></p> | 15    |

| Question | Answer  | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 3(b)     | <p><b>How far do Sources A to D agree that the League of Nations had a good chance of success?</b></p> <p><b>Source A</b> does not see much chance of success because the League will have no military backing. The author points out to Wilson that an army was needed against Germany in the First World War.</p> <p><i><b>Source A</b> is by a French delegate at the peace talks. After France's experiences in the First World War it is not surprising that he wants the League to have more power to enforce its decisions. His fear that France will be under threat from Germany again in the future influences his view. He is trying to get Wilson to agree to more power for the League and therefore might be overstating the weaknesses of the League.</i></p> <p><b>Source B</b> The usual accepted interpretation of this cartoon is that the League is to launch into a bright future and be a success. The clouds are clearing, and the sun is rising, and it will achieve disarmament and the end of war. <b>Source B</b> offers some challenge to the idea in that a possible interpretation is that despite the high hopes for the League it will topple over the edge of the cliff when it tries to take off and therefore fail.</p> <p><i><b>Source B</b> is a British cartoon and represents hopes in Britain that the League will lead to a better future. The League was more popular in the country than it was with British Governments of the time. Therefore, although the source represents popular feelings, it might be too optimistic.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> claims that the League can succeed because it has popular support which is more permanent than the shifting allegiances of governments. It promises people peace and justice. <b>Source C</b> also has several reasons why it has little chance of success as early as 1920 - national selfishness, its weapons such as discussion are too weak and no good for the difficult world of 1920.</p> <p><i><b>Source C</b> is written by an American and the first paragraph represents a view popular in America that the selfishness of the European powers will prevent the League from succeeding. However, Fosdick was a supporter of Wilson and the second paragraph represents Wilson's hopes for the League.</i></p> <p><b>Source D</b> claims it never had a chance of succeeding because it is just a talking shop and has no power to enforce its decisions.</p> <p><i><b>Source D</b> is from Clemenceau who was sceptical of the League from the beginning. As a Frenchman he does not think it has the power to be useful in providing France with security. Clemenceau is writing his memoirs long after he had been in power and is trying to justify his opposition to the League and claim that he had been right all along. By the time he wrote these memoirs in the late 1920s the League had seen failures and successes.</i></p> | 25    |