



Cambridge
International
AS & A Level

Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

HISTORY

9389/12

Paper 1

October/November 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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **9** printed pages.

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

9389/12

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	To what extent do Sources A and B agree on the reasons for Piedmont's entering the Crimean War? <u>Indicative content</u> Similarities include: Both sources suggest that Piedmont will gain from joining the war. Differences between Source A and Source B include: Source A is about what Piedmont can gain from the war whereas Source B is much more about peace and restoring stability. Source A mentions dealing with revolutionaries whilst Source B not as clear about what they will get – it does not mention revolutionaries. Source A is about the strengthening of Piedmont internally whereas Source B is about gaining foreign input. <i>Source A comes from an experienced observer, who probably has an informed and detached point of view. Obviously the British might well be anxious for Piedmont to join her side in the Crimean War. The report was not for publication and there would be no reason to assume any bias or distortion. Source B is accurate. It contains the formal and agreed terms and would be important at the later Peace Treaty.</i>	15

9389/12

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	‘The cause of Italian unification gained from Piedmont’s involvement in the Crimean War.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? <u>Indicative content</u> At face value Source A clearly supports the hypothesis by listing many possible gains of involvement in the Crimean war. Candidates may use contextual knowledge to point out that this source is hopeful rather than what happened although Hudson does set out many of the long term aims of Italian Unification. <i>Source A is a perceptive comment by a trained observer. It was not intended for publication and the author had no reason to show any bias. He was paid to be detached and well informed and there is no reason to doubt its validity.</i> Source B does suggest that the ‘state of Italy’ will be taken into consideration and it could be argued that financial incentive would help Piedmont in its motives. Contextual knowledge may suggest that this consideration was not quite to the extent which many in Piedmont wanted. <i>Source B is a formal document signed between three countries and was destined for publication (bar the secret parts!) There is no reason to doubt its validity and it is an exceptionally useful document.</i> Source C suggests that the involvement has not been helpful and that Piedmont was disappointed by the outcome of the war. Contextual knowledge may suggest that its involvement was not quite as critical as is portrayed here but this is maybe to be expected. <i>Source C is again a formal public document which again is reliable in terms of Piedmont’s thinking. Naturally it would present Piedmont’s case in a favourable light (the ‘critical’ intervention) and perhaps overstates its ability (or wish?) to deal with the ‘revolutionary spirit’.</i> Source D can be seen to support and challenge the hypothesis. It is much more positive about the outcome of the talks. Clearly Napoleon was sympathetic and the point about the Pope is very revealing in the light of later events. The point about the revision of 1815 is a vital one in terms of principle. However, Cavour does not feel it was a great achievement in terms of what he and his country have put into the conflict. <i>Source D is an important document, not intended for publication. Given the author and its recipient it is a clear indication of Cavour’s views and there is no reason to doubt its validity.</i>	25

9389/12

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	To what extent do Sources A and B agree on the impact of the Dred Scott judgement on the issue of slavery? <u>Indicative content</u> Similarities include: Both see the judgement as having a great impact on the slavery question, making it more of an issue than previously. Both argue that the judgement will require a response from Congress. Differences include: Whereas Source A sees the judgement as initiating a political struggle over slavery, Source B sees the judgement as ending the arguments over slavery. Source A sees the people having to respond to the judgement in order to roll back the slave-owning conspiracy by a republicanising Congress while Source B argues that Congress must simply accept the judgement. <i>Both sources are from very contemporary newspaper reports, Source A from a free state and Source B from an unfree state. Both would appear to be editorials, giving the newspaper's view of the judgement. Thus both will be sectional and partisan. While the language of Source B is more emotional than that of Source A, Source A's identification of a broad-based slave-owning conspiracy is a more emotional response to the situation. Neither are reliable.</i>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	'The Dred Scott judgement was a huge setback for the abolitionist cause.' How far do Sources A to D support this assertion? <u>Indicative content</u> Source C supports the assertion. It argues that the Dred Scott decision means the death of Republicanism [with a capital R, note], the main hope of the abolitionist movement. It quotes an attack on the judgement from the <i>New York Tribune</i> in order to conclude that the sectionalism is dead and the Democratic party dominant. <i>In implicitly arguing that the Dred Scott judgement is a setback for the Abolitionist cause, Source C comes as something of a surprise when its provenance is considered. Source C comes from a New England newspaper, which might be expected to support abolitionism. That it doesn't is a warning against generalising about free-unfree, North-South divisions before the Civil War. New Hampshire in 1857 must have contained enough people who opposed the abolition of slavery sufficiently to agree with this editorial – and to keep the newspaper in business. In this respect, the editorial is quite rude about the much-esteemed New York Tribune.</i> The content of the other Sources can be interpreted as being a mixture of support [mainly] and challenge. Source A mainly supports the assertion in arguing that there is a Democrat-led conspiracy of slave-owners, which must harm the abolitionist cause. Only in the final sentence does Source A argue that 'the people' will take action to roll back the conspiracy, thereby advancing the abolitionist case. <i>Source A, from New York, talks of a slave-owning conspiracy involving all three branches of the federal government and refers to the North as law-abiding. And talk of conspiracy, always hard to prove, was even harder to prove with regard to the heated atmosphere of early 1857. Source A's analysis does not withstand close scrutiny.</i> Source B mainly supports the assertion but leaves abolitionists the right to continue to argue their case. <i>Source B is another source which fits sectional expectations, using emotional language to describe the reaction of the North. Cross-reference to the two Northern sources, A and C, hardly supports the assertions of Source B.</i> Source D is perhaps the most even-handed of the three. It argues that the Dred Scott judgement could result in the whole of the USA becoming a slave state unless 'every right-thinking man' votes to stop it happening. <i>Finally, Source D, from Lincoln. While his statement puts the anti-slavery case, it does so in a factual and unemotional way. His hopes for the resolution of the crisis of slavery prove to be far too optimistic but predicting the outcome of an issue as complex as slavery in the USA of the 1850s was a forlorn task. Contextual knowledge needs to be used to help evaluate Lincoln's exposition. The Dred Scott judgement was an undoubted setback for the abolitionists. However, it was so radical a judgement that it spurred the abolitionists and those wanting to contain slavery to the South to take political action to overturn the judgement. Context shows that in most respects Lincoln's analysis proved correct.</i>	25

9389/12

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B regarding President Wilson's proposals for a League of Nations. <u>Indicative content</u> Similarities include: Both sources are in favour of the League in principal (whilst disagreeing on U.S. involvement). Both agree that Wilson has/will have an important role in drawing up the plans for the League. Differences between Source A and Source B include: Source A praises Wilson's leadership skills calling him 'gallant and noble' whereas Source B accuses him of 'simply playing politics'. Source A calls critics of his plans and tactics 'foolish' whilst Source B says opposition Senators have been forced to be 'stronger headed than the President'. Source A suggests that the League would promote commerce, civilisation and brotherly love whereas Source B implies that the issues should be left to other countries to deal with. <i>The majority of those Americans who opposed Wilson's plans were not against the concept of a League of Nations in principle. They did, however, reject the wording of the Covenant being drawn up in Paris, believing that certain articles would undermine the USA's national independence, threaten American national interests and involve the USA in unwanted and unnecessary future wars. Rather than rejecting the proposals for a League of Nations entirely, Republican Senators drew up a list of reservations. Wilson refused to accept these, insisting that the Covenant must remain exactly as it was negotiated by international delegates at Paris. The key issue in the debate, therefore, was not as simple as 'Are you for or against a League of Nations' – rather it was 'Are you for or against the Covenant as drawn up at the Paris peace talks?'</i>	15

9389/12

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	‘On his return home from Paris in 1919, President Wilson had every reason to believe that the USA would join the League of Nations.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? <u>Indicative content</u> Source A supports the hypothesis by giving a clear view of public support for Wilson’s proposals. The writer shares Wilson’s idealistic views on the prospects of the League of Nations and criticises Republican opposition as being foolish and politically motivated. <i>The writer of this letter takes a clearly internationalist viewpoint and the emotive language used throughout: e.g. – in praising Wilson (gallant, noble); in criticising Wilson’s opponents (lack intelligence, foolish, politically motivated); in supporting the idea of a League of Nations (alleviate, brotherly love, civilisation) could be used to suggest a one-sided view.</i> That isolationism remained a powerful force in the USA is evident from Source B which challenges the hypothesis. The writer is heavily critical of Wilson’s involvement in the Paris peace talks, arguing that European countries should be left to sort out their own treaties. While Source B does not completely reject the idea of a League of Nations, its writer is clearly of the view that the USA should only become involved in international affairs when its own national interests are a stake. <i>The letter adopts an isolationist tone, its writer clearly agreeing with the Republican views of Lodge, Borah etc. Wilson’s leadership skills are heavily criticised, while the idea of a League of Nations is seen as less significant than European nations agreeing treaties to end the hostilities of WWI. The letter is heavily opinionated: e.g. – ‘As far as I can see’; ‘my idea’; ‘to my mind.’</i> Source C can be used to argue both for and against the hypothesis. The results of various opinion polls outlined in Source C would have given Wilson reasons to feel confident that he could maintain and increase public support. However, it is interesting that the poll of soldiers conducted during a theatrical performance in New York [as recorded in Source C] showed a majority against the idea of a League of Nations and contextual understanding may be used to analyse this. <i>The newspaper clearly recognised that the issue of the League of Nations was both important and divisive. It simply reports the outcome of various polls taken to establish public opinion regarding Wilson’s proposals for a League of Nations. It draws no conclusions from these statistics, although the opening and concluding sentences might suggest that the newspaper itself is in support of Wilson’s proposals.</i> Source D can also be taken to support or challenge the hypothesis. It implies that Republican opposition was both unnecessarily excessive and overly aggressive, something from which Wilson would be able to make political capital by publically criticising his opponents for putting their own narrow interests before the desire for world peace. However, the strength of Republican opposition to Wilson generally, and his negotiations at the Paris peace talks in particular, is clear from Source D. Since the Republicans had gained control of the Senate, Wilson would have found it very difficult to achieve ratification for his proposals.	25