



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY**9389/11**

Paper 1 Document Question

October/November 2020**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 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **12** 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.

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
1(a)	Compare and contrast the views given in Sources A and B on Napoleon's motives for entering a war against Austria in Italy Similarities include: - Napoleon aimed to liberate Italy. Source A states that 'the Orsini trial seems to show Napoleon not only as the master of Italy's fate but also as a supporter of Italian liberty' while Source B says that 'the liberation of Italy was an urgent necessity for the Emperor'. - Napoleon was motivated by earlier experiences. Source A mentions 'the time when he was a conspirator in central Italy' while Source B 'just as he had attempted to in 1831'. (It's not clear whether the latter reference came from Napoleon III or from his doctor or from the Tuscan politician but credit the reference.) Differences include: - Source A identifies one motive, to help liberate Italy, whereas Source B identifies other motives, e.g. to 'become the master of the Mediterranean' and 'to unite the Latin race'. This difference could also be explained as Source A seeing Napoleon's motives are solely to unify Italy while Source B sees Italian unity as a means to an end, i.e. a greater role in Europe. Or it could be explained as limited ambition in Source A vs. great ambition in Source B. - The motive of strengthening his position against Austria / Prussia is shown differently in the sources. Source A is mildly anti-German showing 'distrust and annoyance with Austria' while Source B shows hostility towards 'the Germanic race'. - Source A gives no precise details of what Napoleon wanted to achieve for Italy, merely portraying him as 'a supporter of Italian liberty', whereas Source B is far more precise as it states that 'he is hoping to form three separate states in Italy'. Explanation The similarities and differences between the sources could be explained by reference to the context. Source A, from the diary of the Austrian Ambassador in Paris, is accurate in its comment about the Orsini trial. Candidates could use their knowledge of Napoleon III to assess whether his motives were accurately portrayed in either source. Source B is from an Italian politician writing a private letter to Cavour, the Piedmontese prime minister, at around the time of Cavour's meeting with Napoleon III at Plombières. Cavour was keen to engage the support of Napoleon III against Austria. The Tuscan politician may have a motive in writing to Cavour to reassure him that Napoleon was keen to 'liberate' Italy.	15

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	‘There was full support amongst Italians for a joint French-Piedmontese attack on Austria.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? Support Source A: The exiled nationalists are reported as saying that French intervention in Italian affairs ‘will be strongly supported by all in Italy’. Therefore, Source A supports the statement. Source C: The main message of Source C is that Italians ‘will support our joint enterprise’ against Austria and this supports the hypothesis. Source C mentions Austrian attempts to divide Italy, then dismisses them as ‘so far ineffectual’. Cavour’s claim that Austria is working to divide Italians is probably exaggerated. The main opposition comes only from ‘the dregs of society’. Challenge Source A: The nationalists in exile are trying to persuade Napoleon III that there is support in Italy for his intervention. They are exaggerating the degree of support and this challenges the idea of ‘full support’ in Italy. Source B: challenges the hypothesis. The writer states that ‘whether his ideas ... gain much support in Italy remains to be seen’. Reference is then made to ‘the issue of the separate states. This meant that Italy will not be fully unified and might mean switching Austrian dominance for French, which many Italians would oppose. Source D: Mazzini is totally opposed to French intervention, referring to its possibility as a ‘folly and a crime’. He argues that it would destroy liberty in Italy. Mazzini believes that French intervention would merely replace one foreign master with another. He argues that working with ‘such a despot’ would undermine the principles at the heart of the Italian cause. He believes that Napoleon is intervening in Italy simply to expand his empire. Evaluation Source A: <i>The Austrian ambassador is writing in the spring of 1858, a month after the trial and subsequent death of Orsini. He shows Napoleon III as influenced by exiled Italian revolutionaries living in France. Such people are likely to exaggerate popular support for their cause. However, the ambassador does not suggest that they have exaggerated. That might be because he is based in Paris, not Rome or Genoa. This is a measured account of developments by a trained diplomat.</i>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	Source B: is from a Tuscan politician to the Piedmontese Prime Minister during the month when the latter met Napoleon III at Plombières. He claims to know Napoleon III's ambitions for Italy. If this was true, then he probably wants to influence Cavour's plans as France and Piedmont started to work together. Source B talks of Napoleon III wanting to liberate Italy, presumably from Austrian control. However, there is no mention of Napoleon wanting a united Italy. The last sentence suggest that Napoleon wants separate states. A small state such as Tuscany would want separate Italian states to survive and so the writer has a vested interest in the plans to reform Italy. Source C: Cavour's motives could be considered. He pleads a special case to the ruler of a great power and is desperate to keep Napoleon III committed to war with Austria, as agreed at Plombières a few months previously. The analysis he provides is questionable. Mazzini was supported by more than just the dregs of society. Cavour provides no examples of Austrian efforts to divide Italians. Source D: Mazzini is a republican, believing in popular revolution as the best means of unifying Italy. He is bound to be critical of Napoleon and sees him as acting out of personal ambition rather than for the good of Italy. Candidates can use their contextual knowledge to explain that Mazzini's attempt to create a Roman republic in 1848–49, was overthrown with the assistance of French troops. This may weaken the source. However, it could also be considered that Mazzini's views were shared by others.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Compare and contrast Sources C and D as responses to the passage of the Kansas–Nebraska Act. Differences include: - Source C praises those who passed the Kansas–Nebraska Act for standing firm whereas Source D is more critical, seeing the passage as undermining faith in national and state politicians - Source C sees the Act as ending the slavery question ‘for all time’ whereas Source D sees that the passage of the Act shows slavery to be the one remaining source of division. Similarities include: - Both sources show that these meetings were called specifically in response to the passage of the Kansas–Nebraska Act. - Both meetings were well attended, if in different ways: Source C in numbers of people, Source D in terms of number of parties. Explanation Both sources come from local newspapers, which wish to sell as many copies as they can. As mid-19th century newspapers, they are also likely to have a clear political stance, though in these cases, none is evident. The reporting is factual with no additional comment. Thus, as evidence about local responses to the passage of the Kansas–Nebraska Act, both are useful and reliable.	15

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	The passage of the Kansas–Nebraska Act divided the country over the question of slavery.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? Support Source A: mainly supports the assertion. The Bill was passed in the face of great opposition in the North. There was also determined resistance to the Bill from a minority in Congress – also presumably from the North. Source D: shows how a cross-party meeting of Vermonters has lost faith in politicians and decided to form a new party to protect their interests. They have separated themselves from the politicians who govern them, which marks a deep division. Though Vermonters are united against the Kansas–Nebraska Act, this does not mean the country is united. Challenge Source A: has some doubts about whether the opposition to the Act will persist and thus could be a challenge to the assertion. Source B: argues that the abolitionists bitterly opposed to the Act are untypical of the silent majority, who ‘are motivated by a sound and healthy conservatism’ Source C: the meeting reported in the source sees the Kansas–Nebraska Act is the final settlement of the slavery question. This suggests that the country will not be divided over the question of slavery as this has now been resolved for ‘all future time’. Evaluation Source A: <i>is taken from a Northern abolitionist newspaper and thus is bound to be critical of the Act.</i> Source B <i>is a contemporary report from a newspaper in Tennessee, a Border slave state. As could be expected of a Border newspaper, it is more nuanced than a wholly Northern or Southern source. This is confirmed by its strong and personal criticism of Northern abolitionists such as Horace Greeley. At the same time, it asserts that the territories of Kansas and Nebraska will not become slave states. While underrating the influence of the abolitionists, offers a reasonably reliable assessment of the impact of the Kansas–Nebraska Act on the USA.</i> Source C <i>is optimistic in its conclusion as they believe ‘the question of slavery is finally settled’. This is shown by cross-reference to Source D and events in Kansas in the next few years, usually labelled as Bloody Kansas. However, the outcome of the meeting is different from the newspaper report of that meeting. The report draws no conclusion of its own. The only possible comment on the news it is reporting is its description of the Democrats as ‘true and honest’. This could be seen to suggest a pro-Democrat bias.</i>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	Source D: <i>it reports the outcome of a meeting without obvious comment. If anything, there is even less evidence in Source D of any political bias.</i>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Compare and contrast Sources A and D as evidence about attitudes towards the League of Nations. Similarities include: - Both sources display a positive attitude towards the League. In Source A, Cecil lists positive aspects of the League's work, rescuing Austria from ruin, releasing prisoners and helping refugees. Source D is also positive and states his own role as a Commissioner of the League to 'alleviate the terrible effects of war'. - Both sources are hopeful of the prospect that the League could secure peace. Source A claims that international disputes can be resolved and Source D suggests that the 'evil monster of war can be defeated.' Differences include - Source D is more cautious than Source A regarding how nations relate to each other. Source D argues that governments must be supportive of League policy without keeping anything back. However, Source A suggests that bitterness and humiliation are a thing of the past in relationships between nations. - Source D is most concerned that the League should work together to abolish war and views this as the main concern of the League. Source A is more focused on general cooperation between nations. Explanation The audience and motive of both sources could be used to explain the similarities between them. Cecil was an advocate of the League and his positive attitude can be explained by his work to promote the League. Nansen oversaw League operations to repatriate refugees and was keen to show the League as a success. Like Cecil he is hopeful, which is not surprising given the occasion and his audience. The differences between the sources could be explained by the context of each source. Cecil's book was published in August 1923, therefore written before the Corfu crisis. However, Nansen was speaking in 1926 and uses the opportunity to give a warning of what could happen if the League fails to work together.	15

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	How far do Sources A to D agree that the League of Nations was a success in the 1920s? Support Source A: supports the idea of success and says that the League has worked to rescue Austria from disaster, sort out opium trade, release prisoners, etc. International disputes lose their bitterness because of the League – harmonious impression of League dealings. Source C suggests the League has been successful because it has solved the Greece/Bulgaria dispute. Source D: supports the idea of success as it comes from the Head of Refugees Commission, therefore working to repatriate people displaced by war. Challenge Source A: (although this is not the main argument of the source), candidates may pick up on the ambiguous statement, 'the League can work' which might be seen as admitting there are questions over the effectiveness of the League. Source B: the League has not challenged Mussolini and was passive in responding to his rejection of the role of the League. Small nations are now anxious about their position. Mussolini has been allowed to get away with describing the League as incompetent. Source D: implies that governments haven't been fully behind the League as he says they shouldn't think about 'lines of retreat' or about 'waiting passively'. Evaluation Source A: is a book which was written before the Corfu Crisis. Cecil is an advocate of the League in any case and so is likely to take a positive view. Although this may weaken the source as evidence, candidates could use their contextual knowledge to support the specific examples which Cecil quotes of international cooperation. Source B: is from a British newspaper which is critical of the Council of the League of Nations for not challenging Mussolini's refusal to accept the role of the League in resolving the Corfu conflict. In the early 1920s, British opinion was keen to support the League and the source appears to reflect this concern. However, Britain was a leading power within the League. Therefore, this source could be criticising the British government.	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	Source C is a British cartoon with added text which satirises all three participants in a Balkan border dispute. Greece and Bulgaria are portrayed as squabbling children. That the dove with 'just moral force' ends the minor conflict shows the success of the League, even if only in stopping children from fighting. In its basic description, the cartoon is accurate, though it does reveal the condescending attitude of a great power newspaper towards Greece and Bulgaria. Source D: is from a Nobel Peace Prize winner and a leading figure in the League. Nansen is speaking after six years of relative success for the League. The source is likely to be optimistic about the League's chances. However, it is also rather cautious in its assessment. Nansen is urging powers to be more fully committed to the League. This could be explained by developments which have by-passed the League, e.g. Corfu itself and the Locarno Treaties. The source is more reliable than might be expected of a public speech – but Nansen was not an elected politician and would not make personal gain from this speech.	