

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary Level

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2015 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/11 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.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Page 2	Mark Scheme Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	Syllabus 9389	Paper 11
--------	---	------------------	-------------

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	11

Section A: European Option

Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1848–1871

The role of Piedmont in Italian unification

- 1 (a) To what extent do Sources A and B agree on the reasons why Cavour wanted Piedmont to be involved in the Crimean War? [15]**

Indicative content

Despite the sources coming from the same politician, there is quite a contrast here. Source A is for public consumption while Source B is a private letter. The treaty mentioned in Source A is the 1855 treaty with Britain and France to provide Piedmontese troops for the Crimean war. Source A maintains that doing so was the only way to help Italy gain international recognition. Actions by Italians within Italy had not helped the Italian cause in the recent past. Sending Piedmontese troops to the Crimea would demonstrate to Europe that Italy was capable of self-government and earn it a place at the table of nations. It has an ‘Italian’ focus. By contrast, Source B focuses more on the situation of Piedmont. It shows Cavour’s dislike of Austria and his desire to gain the support of France and Britain in redrawing the map of Italy but for the benefit of Piedmont. Cavour wants to break Austrian power in Northern Italy and, at least in theory, the temporal power of the Papacy in central Italy, while getting compensation for Piedmont in terms of territory. Arguably the motives were much more mundane here. Though Source B is very different in tone from Source A, both are concerned with the position of ‘Italy’ in Europe, both show a focus on political/diplomatic processes rather than ‘revolutions and unorganised outbreaks’.

- (b) ‘Cavour aimed to make Italy a united country.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]**

Context: The Italian cause had suffered a series of setbacks in 1848–9, when Austria defeated Piedmont twice and Pope Pius IX turned from liberal to conservative. From 1852, Cavour was the liberal-conservative prime minister of Piedmont, leading its modernisation at home while aiming to improve its status abroad. His precise aims for Italy remained obscure. He certainly wanted to liberate Italy from the presence of Austria. Whether he wanted a united Italy was much more doubtful; unifying the more progressive North with the more backward South was almost certainly a goal too far for a politician as pragmatic as Cavour. However, for unity to become possible, Italy had to set itself free. On the evidence of 1848–9, this could only be done with the help of the liberal great powers of Western Europe, Britain and France. The Crimean War gave Piedmont a chance to get in their good books. After the war, Cavour might be able to ask for their support in return, presumably against Austria, if not the Papacy. He also began to look for support from Italian nationalists who were prepared to accept the leadership of Piedmont. One such nationalist was Garibaldi.

Analysis: Source A, spoken just before Piedmont went to war, illustrates Cavour’s determination to use the Crimean War to gain international respect and support for Italy. He was well aware that there would be no liberation, let alone unification without it. In his speech to the Piedmontese parliament, Cavour blurs the difference between freedom and unity. Obstacles like Austria and the Papacy were too much for Piedmont on its own. Source B, written just as Russia had accepted peace terms proposed by Austria to end the war, expresses Cavour’s disappointment at what was for Piedmont an early end to the war. Britain would do nothing practical to help free Italy. France, under Napoleon III, might help him redraw the map of Italy in the name of nationalism. Thus Cavour began to look to work with nationalist leaders such as Garibaldi, as is shown by Source C, though whether from principle or self-interest was hard to tell, even on the surface. Source D emphasises the focus on liberation, presumably at the expense of independence.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	11

Evaluation: Source A is using Italian patriotism to gain support for a foreign war in which Piedmont has little obvious interest. It is rather surprising that Cavour emphasises the benefits to Italy when he is talking to the parliament of Piedmont. Cavour's summary of 'the experience of past years' is accurate. Thus the speech might be more reliable as an indication of Cavour's plans than might be first thought. Source B is a private letter and thus perhaps a more reliable indicator of Cavour's intentions. If so, Italian unity is not Cavour's prime concern. However it is a letter of a disappointed politician, one who has not achieved what he had hoped and so he might well hide his true intentions, especially to the head of the Piedmontese army in the Crimea. Evaluation of Source C depends upon which part of the source is considered: the report of the meeting of Cavour and Garibaldi or the personal opinion of Cavour expressed by the author. The reportage is accurate, Cavour and Garibaldi met in 1856 and Cavour encouraged Garibaldi's nationalist ambitions. For his part, Garibaldi was looking to Piedmont for leadership. The Italian National Society, set up a year later, in 1857, also looked to Piedmont. Pallavicino's cynicism is not entirely substantiated by events. Cavour was looking to expand Piedmont but he also accepted the power of Italian nationalism, as shown by the dramatic events of 1859–60. Source D from one ex-colleague of Cavour to another, looking back on developments of the 1850s from May 1870, a few months before Italy absorbed Rome, is likely to be a romanticised view, even if the description of domestic policies does reflect the reality of the 1850s. This suggests that the statement about wanting to liberate Italy might also be reliable. According to Source D, unity was not the aim – though Rattazzi might have been talking about the early 1850s. Cavour's aims did change over the course of the decade.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	11

Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

Lincoln's views on Slavery

- 2 (a) Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence about Lincoln's policies towards slavery after being elected president.** [15]

Indicative Content

Source B is a private letter, written in the interim between election and inauguration, to a Southern politician who supports slavery. It reveals that Lincoln opposed three possible reforms in the position of slaves. Two would improve their position: abolition of slavery in Washington DC and the slave trade in the South. The other, the expansion of slavery into US territories, would benefit slave owners. The state laws Lincoln refers to are laws passed by Northern states to limit the workings of the Fugitive Slave Act. About these he claims to know little. Lincoln stresses how small the gap was between his views and those of Gilmer. Source C is an executive order of the President, published two years into the civil war. In it, he argues that black soldiers captured by the enemy deserve as much protection as white soldiers. If the enemy does not provide that protection by continuing to treat the black prisoners of war as slaves, then Lincoln ordered that similar treatment would be inflicted on the [white] soldiers under Federal control. Lincoln issued the order in response to the harsh treatment of captured black soldiers by the Confederacy, which still saw blacks as slave property and thus not meriting equal treatment. Thus there is a huge contrast between Lincoln's position in December 1860 and his position in July 1863. There are contrasts in the provenance of the sources: private vs. public, personal as opposed to official, peace vs. war. Both sources are reliable. The war had changed everything. There is one major similarity between the two sources, however. In both peace and war, Lincoln bases his arguments on law. In 1860, he uses the law of the constitution to justify his action whereas in 1863 he uses 'the law of nations', international law, and the 'customs of war'. Even in the middle of a brutal civil war, Lincoln acts according to the law. In addition, both sources show Lincoln opposed to slavery but not in favour of full abolition.

- (b) 'Lincoln's attitude towards slavery was consistently conservative.' How far do Sources A to D support this statement?** [25]

Context: Until 1862–3, Lincoln took a very cautious line towards the sensitive issue of slavery. His later reputation as the 'Great Emancipator' arose as a result of his actions while President rather than before. As a matter of principle, Lincoln was always against slavery. The practice of constitutional government, democratic politics and a free market economy caused his position to become more nuanced. He was certainly against the expansion of slavery into new territories, which he saw as the preserve of free white men who should not have to face competition from black slave labour. Thus he opposed the Dred Scott judgement. The fact that all slaves were black brought the issue of race into play. To modern eyes, Lincoln was a racist. He did not believe that the two races should live as one. He favoured the idea that most ex-slaves should either return to Africa or emigrate to new states in central America. On becoming president, Lincoln was intent on preserving the Union and not on freeing slaves. He eventually accepted that slaves should be free because to do so was necessary to win the civil war and thus preserve the Union.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	11

Analysis: Source A mentions slavery only indirectly. It reveals Lincoln's willingness to accept the existence of racial inequality of whites and blacks. Differences between black and white will exist 'forever'. On matters of race, therefore, Lincoln is very conservative. Whether that conservatism applies to slavery as well cannot be determined from Source A. Source B does identify Lincoln's view on slavery. It shows that, even though against slavery, Lincoln accepts the Fugitive Slave Act which many Republicans strongly opposed. Thus when it came to slavery, Lincoln was a cautious conservative, unwilling to support any change in the status quo. Source C reveals a very different attitude towards black soldiers, if not necessarily towards all slaves, in that the order shows Lincoln seeing them as equal to white soldiers. Source D, spoken by an ex-slave eleven years after Lincoln's death and the emancipation of the slaves, is very critical of Lincoln's attitude towards slavery, arguing that he always supported the interests of the whites. Source B shows Lincoln to be against the expansion of slavery which, while conservative, leads him to oppose white slave-owners, who were expansionist. Thus his attitude to slavery contains some inconsistencies: his principled opposition to slavery is radical, his practical acceptance of slavery conservative and perhaps racially based.

Evaluation: Two of the sources are from Lincoln himself. Each needs careful evaluation. One is a private letter, the other a public speech. The letter, Source B, is actually headed 'strictly confidential', which suggests that Lincoln did not want his views to be made public. The speech, Source A, is taken from one of Lincoln's famous debates with Senator Stephen Douglas in 1858. [Charleston is a town in Illinois rather than the city in South Carolina.] The difference of sources might be seen as highlighting the differences between private and public. In public, politicians say what they have to in order to win votes. This would be especially true of this spoken source, taken from the contest to win a seat in the US Senate. The extract shows the audience responding to Lincoln's comments with 'great laughter' and 'applause'. According to the report, his detailed comments come after the laughter. Thus Lincoln was perhaps saying things which pleased his [white] listeners – and won him more support – rather than expressing his real views about the blacks. He could believe in liberty for the slaves without believing them to be equal. Thus Source A must be viewed with great caution. The letter is perhaps more valuable in helping to identify Lincoln's views of slavery because Lincoln is likely to be more honest in a 'strictly private' letter. However, Lincoln's private views in 1860 do not greatly contradict his public statements in 1858. There is a big difference between his views of 1858–60 and those of 1863, as shown in Source C, when he shows a commitment of equality of black and white soldiers. This change is more the result of the needs of war rather than any great change of heart. Spoken by the leading ex-slave of the era, Source D attacks Lincoln for being the white man's president. Douglas's attack gains credibility because it was made at the unveiling of a monument in recognition of Lincoln's work in emancipating slaves. Such an occasion would be expected to praise Lincoln, not criticise him. Thus Source D has great credibility, perhaps supported by Sources A and B. These evaluated sources do show Lincoln to have been profoundly conservative on the issue of slavery.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	11

Section C: International Option

The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

The League of Nations and the World Disarmament Conference, 1932

- 3 (a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B about the value of the meetings which statesmen held in preparation for the World Disarmament Conference.** [15]

Indicative content

The cartoonist (Source A) believes that the preparation meetings were of no value. The statesmen are depicted as bored, uninterested or stupid. The implication is that nothing of real importance was discussed at these meetings – vague generalisations rather than specific details regarding each country's responsibilities under the terms of the League of Nations' Covenant. The League is depicted as a lady holding two symbols of peace – she appears dismayed and frustrated. Einstein (Source B) seems more optimistic about the value of these meetings. He feels that such meetings are essential in order to develop the mutual good will, honesty and trust required if the Conference is to succeed. The meetings would enable statesmen to think beyond their own national interests. Source A implies, therefore, that public opinion in Britain was largely sceptical about the World Disarmament Conference and its preliminary meetings. The expectation that anything meaningful would emerge from the Conference was clearly low. The cartoon clearly expresses the view that politicians lacked the will to make meaningful and decisive commitments regarding arms limitations. Einstein (B) believes that failure to reach agreement on international arms limitations would lead to another war. Therefore the World Disarmament Conference is of vital importance. He is concerned that the Conference will fail if countries put their own interests above their international obligations. He sees the preliminary meetings as a positive sign that statesmen realise the importance of the Conference and the need to prepare for it effectively. Einstein was German (and still living in Germany at the time) and this would have influenced his views. Germany had been forced to undergo arms reduction under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. No other country had carried out arms reduction in line with commitments made under Article 8 of the League of Nations Covenant. Germany expected that the World Disarmament Conference would lead to other nations honouring their commitments, albeit belatedly.

- (b) 'The prospects of the World Disarmament Conference being a success were good.'**
How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]

Context: The Treaty of Versailles imposed arms reductions on Germany and implied that other countries would reduce armaments. Article 8 of the League of Nations' Covenant committed member states to arms reduction: *The Members of the League recognise that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations*. Apart from Germany, no country had complied, a major cause of resentment. Most continued to increase expenditure on armaments. For example, Britain argued that it needed to protect its Empire; France, concerned about a possible German revival, claimed security reasons; the USA, not committed to either the Treaty or the League, wanted to protect and extend its Pacific interests. The World Disarmament Conference was designed to enforce the pledges made in 1919–1920. It was held at a difficult time – world economic problems, political tensions, issues over reparations and war debts and Japanese aggression against China (Manchuria). Unsurprisingly, national interests were to hold sway and no meaningful decisions were made. Hitler used this as the pretext for withdrawing Germany from the Conference and the League, and the excuse for embarking on the re-armament of Germany.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	11

Analysis: Source B suggests that politicians realise the importance of the Conference and that its failure would lead to war. They have made a significant effort to put aside their national interests and to hold preliminary talks in order to develop good will and mutual trust. Source C suggests that it is a positive sign that 60 nations have committed themselves to attend the Conference. Despite major international problems, there was a general feeling amongst politicians that the Conference should not be delayed any further. While Source D accepts that there are major international problems, the source gives three reasons why countries should reach agreement on disarmament at the Conference: world public opinion demands it; it is in every country's own best interests; countries have an obligation under the terms of the Covenant of the League of Nations. On the other hand Source A is pessimistic about the prospects of success as politicians lack the will and intelligence to make meaningful decisions. Preliminary meetings give no reason for optimism. Source B is optimistic but not naïve. There are major issues to overcome (e.g. national interests) if the Conference is to succeed. Source C shows the Conference is held against a background of disturbed international relations. No progress has been made on disarmament. There have been suggestions that the Conference should be postponed yet again. The reasons for going ahead with the Conference (to avoid damaging the prestige of the League and upsetting Germany) do not suggest a positive commitment to disarmament. Germany might have unreasonably high expectations of what other countries were prepared to concede. Source D suggests that there were major difficulties facing the Conference, such as the situation in Far East. Countries had refused to carry out their obligations for over 12 years.

Evaluation: Source A is sarcastic and reflects British public opinion that international politicians lacked the will and commitment necessary for the Conference to succeed. The League of Nations is seen as powerless and ineffective. Countries will put their own interests first. Einstein (Source B) is desperate for the Conference to succeed for he fears the outcome otherwise. As a German, he sees the inequality in Germany being forced to limit its armaments while other countries (potential enemies) have steadfastly refused to carry out their obligations. He desperately seeks reasons to be optimistic about the Conference's prospects of success, seeing the preliminary meetings as a positive sign. However, he is aware of the danger that countries will put their own interests above their international obligations. Source C is a 'matter of fact' report which expresses no opinions. Although represented at the Conference, the USA saw itself in some ways as an 'outsider' – it had not joined the League of Nations and was not obligated under Article 8 of the Covenant. Its isolationist policy meant that it saw itself as removed from the 'political tension existing in Europe'. Despite this US policy had a profound effect on 'the problem of reparations and international debts'. In Source D, as President of the Conference, the speaker's main task was to ensure that meaningful decisions were reached. He uses emotive language to encourage countries to make genuine commitments regarding arms reduction, for example reminding them of their obligations under the Covenant of the League of Nations, their obligation to satisfy international public opinion, the dangers implicit in the build-up of armaments. He is implicitly critical of Japan's actions in Manchuria, using this as an example of what happens when countries ignore their obligations under the League of Nations.