

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2015 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/13

Paper 1 (Document Question), maximum raw mark 40

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 October/November 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 Level – October/November 2015	9389	13

Generic levels of response

Part (a)

Level 4: Makes a developed comparison [12–15]

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.

Level 3: Compares views and identifies similarities *and* differences [8–11]

Compares the views expressed in the sources, identifying differences and similarities. Begins to explain and evaluate the views using the sources and knowledge.

Level 2: Compares views and identifies similarities *and/or* differences [4–7]

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.

Level 1: Describes content of each source [1–3]

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.

Level 0: No relevant comment on the sources or the issue [0]

Part (b)

Level 5: Evaluates the sources to reach a sustained judgement [21–25]

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.

Level 4: Evaluates the sources [16–20]

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.

Level 3: Uses the sources to support *and* challenge the statement [11–15]

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.

Level 2: Uses the sources to support *or* challenge the statement [6–10]

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.

Level 1: Does not make valid use of the sources [1–5]

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.

Level 0: No relevant comment on the sources or the issue [0]

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	13

Section A: European Option

Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1848–1871

Different approaches to Italian Unification

- 1 (a) Compare and contrast the attitudes expressed in Sources A and B about an alliance between Piedmont and France. [15]

Indicative content

Source A argued the need for an alliance with France in order to go to war against Austria in order to drive the Austrians out of Italy. Source B opposed an alliance with France as a means of achieving Italian independence. On the other hand, they do agree that a war of Italian unification needs public support. However, there is a significant difference on this point. Source A says that the war needs the support of French and European public opinion. Source B says this move to national liberation must have the support and involvement of the people concerned. Differences outnumber similarities. This is no surprise, given the origin of the two sources. Source A is from a centrist political leader exercising governmental power and ambitious to increase that power. Source B is from a radical nationalist who has never held government office [apart from a few months as one of the triumvirate of the short-lived Roman republic of 1849] and is suspicious of all government politicians.

- (b) ‘Garibaldi should be seen as the main creator of a united Italy.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]

Context: After the end of the Crimean War in 1856, the pressure for some form of Italian unification had grown, both from a minority of Italians and one or two influential foreigners. The most important foreigner was Napoleon III of France. He was prepared to risk going to war against Austria, if the terms were right. Cavour, the political leader of the most powerful of Italian states, Piedmont, was prepared to work with Napoleon III to achieve his limited goals. By this time, some Italian nationalists, most significantly Garibaldi, were prepared to work with politicians such as Cavour rather than rely on the people to unify Italy. At Plombières in 1858, Cavour and Napoleon III did a deal. Napoleon III delivered on part of the deal, namely going to war with Austria. He ended the war before Piedmont got all the Austrian territory it had been promised. However, the war set in motion a train of extraordinary events, most notably Garibaldi’s expedition to Sicily which led to the formation of the state of Italy two years later. By then, Cavour was dead.

Analysis: Neither Source A nor Source B mention Garibaldi, not even by inference. Source A implicitly gives credit for unifying Italy to Cavour, who brought the guns of France to eject Austria from the peninsula. The only creator of Italian unity identified by Source B is the Italian people. Source C does emphasise the role of Garibaldi in forcing the issue in the South. The final stages of unification might not have happened had Garibaldi not conquered the South. Source D portrays Garibaldi offering a liberty cap to a glum-looking Pope, Pius IX. The only reason why in 1860 the Pope would be so miserable was the defeat his forces suffered at the hand of the Piedmontese army at Castelfidardo. [The cartoon was published eleven days after the battle.] The reference to exchanging caps might mean Garibaldi is attempting to get the Pope to give up the Papacy. Or the immediate context might mean that Garibaldi is trying to get the Pope to accept the loss of lands and power. That Garibaldi makes an offer to the best-known of Italian rulers shows his importance to the process of unification. Thus initial analysis shows that two sources challenge the hypothesis, two support it.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	13

Evaluation: Source A is a communication from a Prime Minister to a King so there is every reason to doubt its worth, especially as Cavour is reporting on his meeting with Napoleon III at Plombières. Testing some of Cavour's account of the meeting against events of the time suggest that it is quite reliable: the two leaders did plan to establish an Italian confederation. Nice and Savoy were handed to France. Source B is also reliable as an explanation of the perspective of an Italian revolutionary. Mazzini's assertion that any war allied with France would be a folly and a crime was in one important respect undermined by Mazzini himself when he supported the war against Austria; his logic was that the war would spur the Italian people to rise up and revolt. His point that 'no nation can be founded on foreign arms' is valid. Events supported his analysis. The war with Austria was followed by action, if only by Garibaldi's Thousand to start with, which did unite Italy. The new Italy, united in part by foreign intervention, was never fully united, fully independent. Source C, from the king of Piedmont to Garibaldi himself, was obviously sent before Garibaldi's forces crossed from Sicily to the Italian mainland. Victor Emmanuel expects the King of Naples to stay as King of Naples, though not of Sicily. Kings were not keen on supporting attacks on other Kings. It shows that even the future King of Italy tried to restrain the great Italian patriot and presumably delay Italian unification in order to uphold monarchical rule. Knowledge of Garibaldi's crossing to the mainland and his eventual meeting with Victor Emmanuel at Teano just three months later should help put this source in perspective. Source D is a cartoon from a country very sympathetic to the Italian national cause in general and to Garibaldi in particular. The cartoon thus would give a prominent role to Garibaldi, which means that it must be discounted as a reliable interpretation. Unless it was intended to be heavily ironic, the message of the cartoon itself is far-fetched: Pius IX had turned away from liberalism in 1848; renouncing the Papacy would be impossible. The cartoon is interesting but unreliable.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	13

Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

The Dred Scott Judgement, 1857

- 2 (a) Compare and contrast the interpretations of the Declaration of Independence given in Sources A and B. [15]

Indicative Content

Note the focus is on the Declaration of Independence and not the Constitution. Source A interprets the Declaration's commitment to equality as excluding negroes, thus contradicting the interpretation made by the Republican Party, as quoted by Douglas. Source A goes on to assert that none of the thirteen states which signed the Declaration actually abolished slavery, which provides a further practical illustration of Source A's interpretation. The Source blurs the distinction between free negroes and slaves. Source B takes the opposite view. It does not contradict Source A's assertion that none of the thirteen ex-colonies abolished slavery. However, it does say that free negroes had political equality with the whites in that both had the vote and both could affect the outcome of elections. Source B also goes on to assert that the Declaration of Independence is much less regarded in the 1850s than it had been in the 1770s and 1780s.

- (b) The Dred Scott judgement greatly benefited the Democratic party.' How far do Sources A to D support this assertion? [25]

Context: The *Dred Scott* judgement was an extremely controversial judgement of the US Supreme Court concerning the very sensitive issue of fugitive slaves. Dred Scott was a slave who thought he had gained his freedom when he went with his master to the free territory of Minnesota. When he was made to return to slavery in the South, he appealed to the US courts to uphold his right to freedom. The Supreme Court ruled against Dred Scott, deciding, firstly, that no black person, whether slave or free, as long as they were of African descent, had the right to bring a case in a US court and, secondly, that no body, judicial or legislative, had the right to deprive the slave holder of his property. In addition, the Missouri Compromise of 1820, which excluded slavery from lands above the 36°30' line of latitude, was overturned. This made legal the expansion of slavery, something most Northerners, whether radical abolitionists or moderate, were strongly against. North-South relations, already strained by Bloody Kansas, deteriorated further as a result of the *Dred Scott* judgement. The North started to use moral arguments against slavery as part of a 'higher law' than the constitutional law as interpreted by the Supreme Court.

Analysis: Source A, from Senator Douglas, a leading Democrat, clearly supports the Dred Scott judgement, which he uses to attack the Republicans defence of black rights. Thus, though Douglas does not mention the Democratic Party by name, he clearly sees it as benefiting from the *Dred Scott* judgement. Source B, from Lincoln, mentions neither Democratic nor Republican party by name. However, he does mention the hopelessness of the position of the blacks, which indirectly must benefit the Democrats. Source C is more explicit about the parties, arguing that neither gained from the *Dred Scott* judgement, which undermines key policy pledges of both parties. Source D clearly believes that *Dred Scott* has put the opponents of the South firmly in their place. The Republican Party has to accept *Dred Scott*, however much it dislikes the judgement. Though the Democratic Party is not directly mentioned by D, the dilemmas facing the Republican Party should benefit the Democrats.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	13

Evaluation: Two sources are from public speeches made by politicians and two are newspaper editorials. Thus all are of dubious reliability and need evaluation by reference to other evidence. Source A comes from a speech by Stephen Douglas, one of the two best known Democratic politicians of the time [the other being the President]. His argument is disproved by contextual evidence. The reality was that some of the thirteen founder states did abolish slavery in the years following the Declaration of Independence. Five did so before 1787 and the establishment of the USA, two more did so by 1804. So the final sentence of Source A could more accurately be reworded to say ‘history records the emphatic answer – yes’. If context undermines Source A, it strengthens Source B. There were five states which freed their slaves and gave them some political rights in 1787. Furthermore, Lincoln’s talk about the situation of the blacks in the mid-1850s being never so bleak is substantiated by the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 and Bloody Kansas. *Dred Scott* simply meant that their position went from bad to worse. Source C is important because it does focus on the position of the two parties, the only source to do so. It argues that the Democrats’ support for popular sovereignty is undermined by the *Dred Scott* judgement. This is valid as the Supreme Court’s judgement argues that no assembly, state or national, can overturn the constitution which preserves the property rights of slave owners. Thus Source C gains in credibility, especially given that it comes from a border state. Source D comes from a newspaper in the Deep South. It believes that the Supreme Court’s judgement will benefit the Democratic Party if only because the Republican Party will have to accept the judgement of the highest court in the land. This was to prove to be wishful thinking. Northern abolitionists such as Seward made the issue of slavery a moral issue subject only to higher laws and not the law of the land. Sources A and D, the two Democratic sources, are severely weakened by contextual evidence. Sources B and C prove to be more reliable. The evaluated sources do not support the assertion.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	13

Section C: International Option

The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

The League of Nations and the Aaland Islands

- 3 (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and D as evidence of the Swedish government's opinions about the League of the Nations in the early 1920s. [15]

Source A shows the Swedish government willing to put their dispute with Finland over the Aaland Islands in the hands of the League of Nations. Like Finland, Sweden expressed confidence that the League would reach an acceptable solution and approved the methods which it was adopting. The Swedish government made it clear that it would accept the League's decision. This suggests that the Swedish government had complete faith in the League. In Source D, the Swedish government is critical of the League. The islands had been taken from Sweden by force and by allowing them to remain in Finland, the League was condoning the use of force as well as ignoring the wishes of the people. The response is sarcastic in its 'attack' on the League the phrase '*at least on this occasion*' suggesting that there were other examples of the League's failure to make the right decision. The source also accuses the League of making a decision which was not likely to maintain peace in the area and makes it clear that Sweden hopes the decision will one day be overturned. This all suggests that the Swedish government had little faith in the League, implying that other countries shared this scepticism. Despite this, Sweden '*loyally*' accepts the League's decision. Source A comes from a US newspaper and is not a direct quote from the Swedish government. It comments on the decision of the governments of Finland and Sweden to allow the League to determine the outcome of their dispute over the Aaland Islands. At this stage, Sweden was confident that the League would decide in its favour. Both countries were under pressure to accept the League's arbitration by more powerful countries keen to avoid a war over the islands. Source B reflects Sweden's disappointment at the League's decision to allow Finland to retain possession of the Aaland Islands. Sweden's willingness to accept the decision was a reflection of its own desire to encourage international law and justice, and its inability to resist the larger powers which controlled the Council of the League. As a direct quote, it is more likely than Source A to give a genuine picture of the Swedish government's perception of the League.

- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that the League of Nations was right to allow Finland to retain possession of the Aaland Islands? [25]

Context: Finland and Sweden contested ownership of the Aaland Islands (some 6500 small islands situated midway between the two countries). The islands had belonged to Sweden until 1809, when they had been taken by force by Russia and attached to the Russian province of Finland. After WWI and the Russian Revolution, they had belonged to the independent state of Finland. The islands' population was almost exclusively Swedish-speaking and there was a strong desire to be reunited with Sweden. With the threat of war between the two countries, Sweden took the issue to the League of Nations, which arbitrated according to the Covenant. Members of the League did not want the dispute to lead to war. In making its decision, the League had to take many things into account such as Sweden's previous ownership of the islands that the islands had been taken from Sweden by force, Finland had owned the islands since 1809, the local people's rights under the principle of self-determination and the wider implications of its decision for future dispute. The League decided to maintain the status quo and left the islands in the possession of Finland.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	13

Analysis: Source B argues that to grant self-determination to the people of the Aaland Islands would have serious repercussions, both in Finland and elsewhere in the world. It states that the islanders are not being persecuted or oppressed by Finland and that their language is not threatened. That the islands belong to Finland is not a threat to Sweden. Source C states that the League's decision was based on a thorough review of all factors related to the dispute. Preserving the status quo was seen as the best way of avoiding on-going problems within the region. The League also wanted Finland and Sweden to work together to ensure future peace in the area. On the other hand Source A could imply that Sweden had a stronger case than Finland due to its historical ownership of the islands and the wishes of the islanders. Source D is critical of the League's decision, claiming that it ignored the principle of self-determination, appeared to justify the acquisition of territory by force and was unlikely to bring peace to the region.

Evaluation: Source A was written for a US audience, not directly involved in the League of Nations. It is objective, merely stating facts without passing judgement, with the aim of informing the audience rather than swaying its opinions. It confirms that Finland and Sweden were prepared to submit to arbitration by the League of Nations. Source B shows that before reaching a decision, the Council of the League of Nations established a Commission to investigate the dispute. This involved jurists who were acquainted with international law. The Commission looked at 'the big picture' as well as the specific details of the dispute. This included an investigation of any threat posed to the Aaland islanders as a result of their being under the government of Finland, the wider implications of submitting to their demands for a plebiscite and the effects of changing the status quo by granting possession to Sweden. Source C confirms that the Council of the League of Nations had taken full account of the report submitted by the Commission. It stresses that Finland and Sweden had agreed to abide by the League's decision. It confirms that its primary aim was to ensure security for the people of the islands and avoid the possibility of future unrest. The source demonstrates how the League intended to follow-up its decision by encouraging and supporting dialogue between Finland and Sweden to ensure future peace. The statement made in Source D shows the immediate disappointment at the League's decision. The Swedish government believed that it had the best case, and would have been surprised by the League's decision. The source is critical of the League. The Swedish government was looking at the case in isolation, whereas the League had to look at the 'big picture', analysing the possible implications of its decision.