Cambridge International AS & A Level

Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

HISTORY **9389/11**

Paper 1 **May/June 2017**

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

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**

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**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	**To what extent do Sources A and B provide evidence that Napoleon's views on Italy had changed greatly between 1856 and 1858?** **Differences between Sources A and B include:** • **Source A** shows Napoleon expecting the settlement of Italy to involve Austria, while **Source B** shows him expecting Austria to be excluded from Italy. • **Source A** shows Napoleon wanting a peaceful, political settlement of the Italian question, while **Source B** shows him prepared to fight to change the map of Italy. • **Source A** shows Napoleon thinking Italy could become a Papal-led confederation, while **Source B** shows him accepting a less national solution in the shape of a Kingdom of Northern Italy. **Similarities include:** • Both sources show Napoleon III expecting violence to shape the future of Italy, whether by war or revolution. • Both show Napoleon III expecting major change in the Italian state system. Source A is a private note written by Napoleon III himself at the end of the Crimean war as the peace treaty was being finalised at the Congress of Paris. As a victorious leader of Europe, he might have had an exaggerated sense of his own importance and his role in redrawing the map of Italy. Source B is a diplomatic note to the Piedmontese Prime Minister several weeks before his secret meeting with Napoleon III at Plombières. As an intermediary, Nigra would try to reflect accurately Napoleon's plans to his political master.	**15**	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	**'The motive for both France and Piedmont for going to war in 1859 was to drive Austria out of Italy.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?** One source clearly **supports** the hypothesis: **Source B.** It reports Napoleon III as wanting Austria out of Italy. This diplomatic memo, presumably confidential, is probably an accurate summary of Napoleon's III's plans. Cross-referencing to the Plombières treaty agreed a few weeks later confirms the reliability of Source B. One source clearly **challenges** the hypothesis: **Source A.** It shows Napoleon III neither wanting war against Austria nor wanting Austria out of Italy. Source A is a private note written by Napoleon III himself at the end of the Crimean war as the peace treaty was being finalised at the Congress of Paris. Unusually, its reliability is undermined by its own contradictions: in one sentence, he says violent means are needed to achieve change, in the next two sentences he talks of change being accomplished peacefully. Source C can be used on both sides of the argument. • **Source C supports** the assertion because it shows Cavour trying to persuade Napoleon III to stick to their agreement to fight Austria. If he did so, Austria would be driven out of Italy. • **Source C challenges** the assertion in that it shows Napoleon III wanting to postpose the war against Austria. If he did so, Austria would remain in Italy. Source C was a direct appeal from Cavour, Piedmontese Prime Minister, to Napoleon III roughly halfway between the Plombières Agreement agreed by the two men and the actual war against Austria in 1859. Cross-referencing to Source D shows Cavour's doubts about Napoleon's commitment to war to be justified and thus the source more reliable than Cavour's opportunist, flexible politics might otherwise suggest.	**25**	Note: 1 The question asks about **both** France and Piedmont. The assertion could be seen as requiring candidates to consider each separately. This is not the case. The key issue is the reason why they together went to war. Was it to eject Austria from Lombardy and Venetia, its two Italian provinces, or was it for another reason, e.g. for domestic prestige? Note: 2 The question does not ask about the motives for going to war with Austria.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	Source D can be used on both sides of the argument: • **Source D supports** the assertion because the King of Piedmont, Cavour and the French army want to go to war against Austria. • **Source D challenges** the assertion because in France *only* the army is in favour. This must mean that Napoleon III is against. Source D is written by an Englishman in Italy in the months before the long-anticipated war against Austria. Cross-referencing to Source C shows Cavour working hard to 'drag France into war', helping to confirm the reliability of Source D. The war itself shows they must have succeeded. The harm to Cavour's reputation in England can be questioned because (a) the journalist is in Rome and (b) presumably he counts himself as one of the 'thinking people in – or in this case from – England. Thus, the reliability of Source D can be argued either way. **Note: The Context of War with Austria in 1859** Events in the late 1840s made it clear that Italy would not unite itself, let alone drive out the Austrians, without international support. Piedmont's involvement in the Crimean War had raised its international standing and it felt that it was owed favours by both France and Britain for its (limited) military involvement on their side against Russia. While Napoleon III was sympathetic to Cavour's ideas, he was also anxious for glory and for French expansion into Nice and Savoy. In addition, though, he had to be wary of Catholic opinion in France, sympathetic to the Papacy, which by this time was against both Italian unification and any war between Catholic states. The Orsini Bomb plot of January 1858, an attempt by an Italian nationalist to assassinate Napoleon III, paradoxically made the French Emperor more sympathetic to the Italian cause. Thus a few months later Napoleon and Cavour agreed to advance the Italian cause by provoking Austria into war.		Note: 3 'Their' in the third line of Source D refers to the King of Piedmont, Victor Emmanuel, and Cavour, and NOT to Napoleon III and Cavour.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	**To what extent do Sources C and D agree about President Monroe's attitude towards the Missouri Compromise?** **Differences between Sources C and D include:** • While **Source C** states that Monroe advised firmness and decision, **Source D** sees Monroe as vacillating over whether to veto the Compromise • **Source C** shows that Monroe might well object to the Compromise, as it attempted to restrict state sovereignty - while **Source D** shows him signing the Compromise. **Similarities include:** • Both see Monroe as close to vetoing the Compromise • Both see Monroe as vacillating [depending upon which part of Source C is used] • Both see Monroe as objecting to the Compromise's limits on state power • Both mention the possible impact of the 1820 presidential election. Source C was written before Monroe signed the Compromise, Source D was written long after. Source C was written to influence opinion in Virginia. Source D was written by someone presumably very familiar with the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, a very controversial Act which repealed the Missouri Compromise. Therefore, she would probably want to write a partial account rather than a true history.	**15**	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(b)	**How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that the Missouri Compromise was in fact a victory for the North?** **Source A**, from the Missouri Compromise itself, can be used on both sides of the argument: • **Source A supports** the assertion in that it mentions the 36°30' dividing line between free and unfree states. The state of Missouri excepted, no slave states can be established north of that line in the lands bought from France seventeen years before. • **Source A challenges** the assertion in that it mentions the fugitive slave law which still applies in the lands above 36°30 line. The best way of evaluating Source A in relation to the question is by using contextual knowledge. Slavery was definitely prohibited north of 36°30' from 1820 onwards – until 1854 at least. The fugitive slave law, which benefited the South, depended upon the co-operation of the authorities in the North. Source A is only partly accurate in conveying the legal reality. Thus, it is not wholly reliable. **Source B challenges** the assertion in that it argues that the Missouri Compromise, and especially its geographical dividing line, will risk conflict between free and unfree states and thus threaten the very existence of the USA. No one will gain from agreeing the Missouri Compromise. This is a letter written by a leading Founding Father and thus authoritative, if very pessimistic. He was also a slave-owner, if one who took the view that emancipation would eventually come. Thus, his slave-holding could be used either way, to decide the source is unreliable – because pro-South – or reliable because he could recognise arguments on both sides. What cannot be used as part of the evaluation process is his expectations for the future, however accurate they might be.	**25**	Note: 4 Some candidates will equate 'the Union' with the North, probably based on divisions in the civil war, when the North was equated with the Union. Source B distinguishes between the two.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	Source C also supports the assertion in that it argues that Monroe might veto a states' rights bill. To stop such a bill would be disastrous for the South. In addition, the possibility of the South dividing would also mean a victory for the North; the South must remain united. Written by a Southern politician a few weeks before the Missouri Compromise was signed and while Monroe's attitude was unclear, this is probably an attempt to rally Southern support in order to influence the content of the Compromise. Cross-referencing to Source D shows that the fear of a veto was not unfounded. Despite this, Source C is unreliable because it is from a party politician seeking to gain political support. **Source D largely supports** the assertion. It shows Monroe signing the Compromise, despite his doubts about its constitutionality, Source A tells us that the Compromise was, on balance, a victory for the North. If Monroe signs the bill, then he is helping the North to gain the quantifiable benefits of several new free states while the South gains only the unquantifiable benefit of the extension of the Fugitive Slave Act. The provenance of the source raises doubts about its reliability. The authorship suggests a likely partiality while the title suggests the book focuses more on the link between the two Compromises on inclusion of new states, those of 1820 and 1850, rather than on the Missouri Compromise itself. Cross referencing to Source C shows that Monroe issuing veto was a matter of debate in 1820, which suggests some reliability. Thus, the reliability of Source D is open to detailed discussion.		Note: 5 In line three of Source D, 'it' refers to the veto, not the Compromise. This is an important distinction to make. Source D is not saying that the Compromise risked civil war.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	Note: The Context of the Missouri Compromise of 1820. The 1820 Missouri Compromise was a response to the need to convert more US territory into states, while retaining the numerical balance between free and slave states. It resulted in the inclusion of Missouri, which chose to be a slave state, as well as the free state of Maine. Crucial to the Compromise was the exclusion of slavery from any lands gained from France in 1803 north of latitude 36°30', which was a huge area of land to the north-west of the Mississippi. The only exception agreed by Congress was Missouri itself, most of its southern border being drawn at 36°. The Compromise successfully balanced the interests of northern and southern states. It proved quite durable, lasting until the 1850s, when the USA faced the problems of including the new lands gained from Mexico in 1848 as well as Texas. In terms of sectional politics, the South – and especially the state of Virginia – dominated the early politics of the USA. Five of the first six Presidents, including Monroe, came from Virginia. The party divisions of the late 1810s and early 1820s were relatively minor. The period of Monroe's two presidencies, 1817–25, is often equated with what was called at the time the Era of Good Feelings. Monroe was re-elected unopposed in 1820. The only sectional dispute of the time was the debate concerning the admission of Missouri itself		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	**Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of Communist attitudes towards participation in the League of Nations.** **Differences between A and B** concerning communist participation in the League of Nations include: • While Source A is opposed to Soviet participation, Source B accepts it. • While Source A sees the League as approving preparations for [imperialist] war, Source B sees it as helping to prevent war preparations by Japan and Germany. **Similarities include:** • Both sources see war as likely. • Both see the League as hiding dubious practices via camouflage [A] or deceptions [B]. Source A is a [public?] speech, made by the leader of the USSR at a time when it faced few, if any threats. Stalin speaks in general and ideological terms. There are no references to specific events or countries. Source B is a magazine article written by American communists in 1934, when the USSR, the leader of the communist world, was facing direct threats on its western and eastern borders. Its language is less generalised, less ideological. It has some specific examples. Its portrayal of the League of Nations is likely to be more reliable than that of Source A. At least, its statements can be more easily tested by reference to contextual knowledge than can Source A's.	**15**	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(b)	'**The Soviet Union did not believe that the League of Nations could encourage peace and security.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?** **Source A supports the assertion**. It argues that the League actually allows for war among the capitalist powers. The Source maintains that the League acts as a camouflage for the aggressive policies of these powers. Source A is a speech by Stalin, the Soviet leader, to a group of foreign delegates in 1927, the tenth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. He will want to stress the superiority of communism over capitalism. Thus, it is unreliable. This evaluation is supported by contextual knowledge. In 1927, the leading capitalist powers were disarming rather than rearming. **Source D also supports** the assertion in that it sees the League as, from the start, a feeble and failing institution, dominated as it was by France and Britain. There was some hope when the USSR joined but that hope had gone now it was being thrown out. Source D comes from the official Soviet newspaper reporting after the League of Nations had expelled the USSR. Thus, it is bound to be very critical of the League. Several of its critical assertions are not supported by contextual knowledge: it is extremely unreliable. The remaining sources can be interpreted as either challenging the assertion or supporting it. **Source B supports** the assertion in that it argues that the League remained imperialist: the departure from the League of Germany and Japan 'little alters its imperialist character'. **Source B challenges** the assertion in that it argues that joining the League might enable the USSR maintain peace and [collective] security against Germany and Japan.	**25**	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	Source B's analysis of the situation in 1934 can be supported by contextual knowledge. It also has few illusions about the League, which it maintains is still pro-imperialist. Finally, it finishes by criticising the USSR for its hypocrisy, an unusual line for a communist journal to take. Thus, it is more reliable than not. **Source C supports** the assertion in that it says that the League could not uphold peace, as shown by the failure of the Disarmament Conference. **Source C challenges** the assertion in that it says that the League could uphold peace in the future [now that the USSR has joined]. Source C is a speech by the Soviet representative to the League of Nations in 1934, the year when the USSR joined the League. It is critical of the League in the past, more optimistic about its future – not unsurprisingly. Given the speaker, the audience and the event, this is a very unreliable source. **Context** In the wake of the 1917 revolution, the USSR, the first and only Marxist state of the time, was neither invited to the Paris peace talks nor accepted as a member of the League of Nations. In the 1920s, as the League established itself, the USSR criticised it on ideological grounds. Soviet sources claimed that the League of Nations had been established simply to enhance the power of Britain and France, the two dominant imperialist powers. By 1934, circumstances had changed. The USSR faced the challenge of Nazi Germany to the west and imperialist Japan to the east, both expansionist powers. The withdrawal of Japan and Germany, in 1933 and 1934 respectively, undermined the reputation of the League of Nations. These withdrawals helped decide Stalin to join the League for reasons of security. The Soviet Union remained a member of the League until 1940, consistently arguing for a more proactive approach to issues such as disarmament and opposition to aggressive actions (e.g. over the Italian invasion of Abyssinia).		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	By the late 1930s, it was clear that the League of Nations had failed in its primary aim to preserve peace and security, most notably with the outbreak of World War II in 1939. In December 1939, the Soviet Union was expelled from the League of Nations following its invasion of Finland		