



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY**9389/12**

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 Sources C and D as evidence about the international consequences of the Franco-Prussian war. Similarities include: - Both sources write of the change that the war has brought about with Source C referring to ‘the power, military glory and renown’ as consequences of the war and Source D also refers to the change stating that ‘the war represents the German Revolution, a greater political event than the French Revolution last century’. - The sources agree about the shifting balance of power within Europe. Source C suggests that Germany has grown more powerful but has also lost allies whilst Disraeli talks about the shifting balance of power. Differences include: Source C is very negative about the international consequences of the war for Germany. Germany is believed to be ‘capable of every wickedness’ and according to the Crown Prince of Prussia ‘the distrust of us grows more and more pronounced’. However, in Source D Disraeli does not discuss this aspect stating ‘what its social consequences may be are a matter for the future’. - The Crown Prince in Source C is much more concerned about the consequences of the war internationally on Germany. By pursuing this war ‘Bismarck has robbed us of our friends, the sympathies of the world and our conscience’. In contrast Source D is much more concerned about the effects of the war on Europe’s management of foreign affairs maintaining ‘there is not a diplomatic tradition that has not been swept away’ and further states that ‘the balance of power has been entirely destroyed’. Explanation Source C is an extract from the Crown Prince’s war diary in which he is presumably expressing his private concerns during the war. The war did leave France with a lasting hatred for Germany, but Bismarck did form new alliances with Russia and Austria with the aim of keeping France isolated. Source D is a speech by Disraeli to the House of Commons. He is speaking of the rise of Germany as a great power. As such, he is trying to impress upon the House of Commons the changes that this will bring.	15

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	'The Franco-Prussian war brought few benefits to Germany.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? Source A supports the assertion. It is written by the Crown Princess of Germany during the war. She writes of how the Germans want to keep Alsace and Lorraine but she fears 'we shall be doing a wrong thing'. She is concerned that it could result in Germany 'being attacked and overrun by the French whenever it suits them, as our frontiers are too weak to keep them out'. To have a long period of peace Germany would need to make its 'frontier so formidable' to prevent it from being attacked. N.B. Candidates may also use their contextual knowledge to argue that Source A suggests there were benefits i.e. Germany took control of A-L after the Franco-Prussian war and therefore more secure. Source B challenges the assertion. The report of the meeting of the Reichstag states that Germany's efforts 'go beyond victory on the battlefield and foreshadow the peaceable completion of the work of unification'. The source maintains that German victories will enable Germany to look forward to 'permanent unity'. Source C supports the assertion as it states that Germany is 'deemed capable of every wickedness and the distrust of us grows more and more pronounced'. It is saying that there is a high price to pay for becoming great and powerful. The source blames both Bismarck and the war, asking 'what good is all this power, military glory and renown if hatred and mistrust meet us at every turn?' However, the source does to an extent challenge the assertion. It maintains that Germany has 'power, military glory and renown' and Bismarck has made Germany 'great and powerful'. Source D challenges the assertion as Disraeli believes that the war 'represents the German revolution'. The war has resulted in 'a new world, new influences at work, new and uncrowned objects and dangers with which to cope'. It implies that Germany is powerful and that 'the balance of power has been entirely destroyed'. This shows that the Unification of Germany has had a powerful effect on Europe. The source is much more concerned with the effect of the 'German revolution' on Europe and does not focus on whether it brought benefits to Germany. Evaluation Source A: <i>The Crown Princess is writing to her mother, Queen Victoria. She is giving her personal opinion. She is clearly aware of the situation that Germany finds itself in and of the importance of the Alsace region. Contextual knowledge tells us that Germany gaining control of this region as a result of the war was important for their border going forwards.</i>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	Source B: It is true that Germany did achieve unity after the war. However, the Reichstag is keen for the King of Prussia to accept the imperial crown, so is emphasising his role in achieving the victories. The Reichstag does not refer to the efforts still to be made in persuading some southern states to accept unification, so the source is somewhat incomplete there. In addition, the King himself was reluctant to accept the role which could explain the reason for praising him – they are trying to persuade him to lead in the way they want him to. Source C: The Crown Prince, although he fought in the war, was not a keen supporter of war or the leaders that supported it. His views represent his concerns about the wider effects of the war on Germany. Therefore, his negative summary of the impact of the war can be questioned. Subsequent events were to prove him correct although this was due to Germany's leadership rather than to unification. Source D: Disraeli is naturally concerned about how the new Germany will impact on Britain's international relations. His view is very much that of an outside power but with knowledge of the situation in Germany. He is using strong language emphasis what a great change he believes has happened, especially with his reference to 'revolution'.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Compare and contrast Sources B and D as evidence of attitudes towards the election of Abraham Lincoln as President in 1860. Similarities include: - Both articles state that the election of Lincoln was opposed in the Border slave states. Source B refers to ‘the large vote polled in Border slave states by Mr Bell and Senator Douglas’. John Bell represented the Constitutional Union Party and Stephen Douglas the Democratic Party. Source D, too, from a border state newspaper refers to its opposition to Lincoln’s election. It states ‘we strongly opposed Mr Lincoln because we fully anticipated the dreadful events that have followed his election’. Differences include: - The attitude of the author of Source B is that he is pleased that Lincoln won the election. He writes ‘next to the election of Abraham Lincoln no circumstance of the recent contest has been so gratifying’ as the support received at the polls in the slave border states of Mr Bell and Senator Douglas. In contrast the attitude of the author of Source D objects to his election beginning his article with ‘we strongly opposed Mr Lincoln’. Source B demonstrates that the people of the Border slave states hate the Republican Party but not as much as the ‘disunionists’ of the South. It states that ‘however hateful the Republican Party of the North may appear in their eyes’ they have ‘a more supreme hatred and contempt for the disunionists of the South’. In contrast, in Source D the attitude to Lincoln’s election is that they hope he ‘may be a patriot’. They hope that Lincoln will not wage war on the South as this, ‘could accomplish no rightful purpose but would work terrible ruin to both sections’. Source B’s attitude is that even though Lincoln has been elected, they will continue to support the Union. It states that ‘they have a love for the Union deeper and more abiding than that for party or section’. In contrast, Source D’s attitude is much more of a wait and see approach, and that they must look after themselves. The Border States ‘plain duty to themselves and their country is to watch the progress of events calmly and keenly and to be ready to meet wisely whatever crisis may arise’. Explanation Source B is a Northern newspaper that clearly supports the Union and implies that it supports the Republican Party. However, it is not highly critical of these slave states. The Newspaper’s report on them being pro the Union is only reliable to an extent as Tennessee and Virginia both seceded. Source D is a Border state newspaper. It states that they do not intend to be impulsive and clearly supports these states in not taking any rash action. It is just stating what approach they are going to take.	15

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	How far do Sources A to D support the view that, following the election of Abraham Lincoln, the Southern states were united in their determination to secede? Source A supports the assertion. The source argues that, if South Carolina starts the process of secession, other Southern states will follow its lead. Though it is unclear whether the ‘other states’ referred to in the second to last sentence includes Southern states, that possible limitation is more than offset by the ‘men of action’ in all Southern States want South Carolina to get the procession of secession underway. Source B challenges the assertion. According to the article the Border slave states ‘have a love of the Union deeper and more abiding than that for party or section’. The citizens of these states believe that ‘the Republican Party of the North is hateful’. However, they have ‘a more supreme hatred and contempt for the disunionists of the South’. This article gives no indication that these states wish to secede. The article is from a Northern newspaper which is clearly in favour of retaining the Union. It is basing its conclusion purely on the election results. However, during the war Tennessee and Virginia both seceded. Source C also challenges the assertion in that one Southern state, Maryland, is seen as opposing secession. Maryland can be discounted because it is a Border State, as illustrated by Source B. The other two states, South Carolina and Georgia, are united in their determination to secede. The report from South Carolina also reports that ‘neighbouring states’ are planning to help South Carolina resist federal coercion. Thus, it could be argued that Source C supports the assertion. Source D challenges the assertion. It states that ‘dreadful events’ have already followed Lincoln’s election but does not advocate hasty action. The article comments that the Border States’ ‘plain duty to themselves and to their country is to watch the progress of events calmly and keenly and to be ready to meet wisely whatever crisis may arise.’ Source D states that the Border States should not act rashly. It maintains that ‘impulsive moves at a time like this would be a sin against earth and against heaven’. Evaluation Source A: <i>is taken from a newspaper in South Carolina, the most secessionist of all the Southern states. The newspaper reflects the views of the firebrands of South Carolina. Thus, in any analysis of the unity of the South after Lincoln’s election, it is partisan and unreliable.</i> Source B: <i>is a contemporary report from a newspaper in a Northern state and thus likely to be critical of the South. The only evidence it provides to support its assertion is the election results. Such results are always open to a range of interpretations. For two reasons, therefore, Source B is an unreliable source.</i>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	Source C: is a Southern source which, unusually, contains brief reports from three other Southern states. Those reports make Source C a useful source. The reports are fairly neutral in their use of language. There is nothing in Source C to suggest that it is unreliable. Source D: is a comment piece from a Southern Border State newspaper. Unlike the other three sources, all dated November 1860, Source D is written in early 1861. By this time, seven states have seceded and some federal forts in those states have been seized. The seizures have escalated the crisis as the response of the federal government to those seizures is awaited. Most of the source concerns what the Border States should do in the future. Thus, as evidence of the current state of Southern unity, Source D is of limited use and reliability.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Compare and contrast Sources A and C as evidence about the Corfu crisis. Similarities include: • Source A states that success for the League ‘would open the way for that body to become a potent force in world settlement. However, he goes on to state that ‘failure would mean an end to the Geneva assembly’. It regards the outcome of the Corfu crisis as important to the League’s future; it was written before the outcome was known. • In Source C, Mussolini speaks similarly of the League. He sees the crisis as offering ‘the opportunity of pronouncing a verdict that would go down in history’. • Important for the future of the League. • Mussolini is challenging the League. • British and French relations with Italy under strain because of the invasion. • Has a wider impact on how Italy relates to the rest of Europe. Differences include: • Source A stresses that ‘Britain insisted on the League becoming a referee in the dispute’. However, in Source C Mussolini states that ‘Greece very cleverly turned to the League of Nations’ and that the ‘League threw itself into the affair with the greatest excitement’. • Source A was written before the crisis is over. The writer believes that the Corfu crisis will be important in the history of the League. The article states ‘the League of Nations has been given an opportunity to win heavily or lose everything’. However, in contrast Mussolini in Source C believes that the crisis ‘is of the very greatest importance in the history of Italy’. He states it has ‘brought the problem of the League of Nations to the attention of the Italian public’. • Britain makes the League take over handling the dispute in Source A while Source C suggests the League ‘threw itself into the affair’. • Source A says this is make or break for the League whereas the League has survived in Source C. Importance here is seen as waking up Italians to what the League is doing. Explanation Source A is written in an American newspaper. The USA had refused to join the League of Nations. The newspaper is exaggerating the effect of its success or failure in handling the crisis on the future of the League. It states that failure would ‘mean an end to the Geneva assembly’. However, Source C is a speech by Mussolini to the Italian Senate made after the crisis. He is emphasising that the Italians used to believe that the League was a lifeless organisation of no importance when. He says that in fact, it is an ‘Anglo-French duet’. Mussolini points out that Italy had been treated as an inferior. The Conference of the Ambassadors had ruled in his favour. He is clearly making the most of this opportunity to express his views about the League and how he had set out ‘to increase the prestige of Italy’.	15

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	‘The Great Powers were determined to put their own interests before those of the League.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? Source A challenges the assertion. It maintains that the seizure of Corfu ‘has placed Britain in a most unhappy dilemma’ because Britain wanted to preserve friendship with Italy while also maintaining the existing order. However, Britain ‘insisted on the League becoming a referee in the dispute’ thus not putting her own interests first. However, it also supports the assertion to an extent as it refers to the fact that friendship between France and Italy ‘has been maintained only with the greatest difficulty’. Also, the fact that Italy had challenged the League can be used to show that they were putting their own interests first. The source refers to the question of the Ruhr which preoccupied France at the time of the crisis. Source B supports the assertion; it shows Poincaré with a newspaper about the occupation of Corfu just turning around and staring at Mussolini. Mussolini has discarded his newspaper about the French occupation of the Ruhr implying he is more interested in his own affairs. However, France as one of the Great Powers is more concerned with events in the Ruhr. The British cartoon depicts both men as unwilling to take action to help each other. Source C supports the assertion. Mussolini maintains that the ‘League threw itself into the affair with the greatest excitement’ and he further maintains that ‘it offered the opportunity of pronouncing a verdict that would go down in history’. Furthermore, he is showing his resentment of the League where ‘Italy’s position has so far been one of absolute inferiority’. On the other hand, ‘Greece very cleverly turned to the League of Nations saying the matter came within the scope of the Covenant’. Therefore, the League intervening on Greece’s behalf can challenge the assertion. Italy was resentful at her treatment at the Paris Peace Conference and Mussolini was determined to raise the prestige of Italy. Source D supports the assertion. Nansen states ‘there must be no secret hopes that if the League is weak in certain areas, it can be made to serve national interests’. He further goes on to state that there have been occasions when the Great Powers ‘have given the impression of acting without proper consideration for the views of the other members of the League’. Nansen’s wish is for the League to be successful. He clearly recognises that the interests of the League have not always been put first. The source refers to Briand who is admitting that the League’s rules have not been followed. He is quoted as stating that members must no longer resort ‘to method of negotiation which are inconsistent with the true spirit of the League of Nations’. However, the end of the source with the quote from Briand could also be used to challenge the statement. Briand is suggesting that there will be co-operation and the countries will try harder to work together.	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	Evaluation Source A: <i>The USA was not a member of the League. It saw the crisis as make or break time for the League stating that failure would lead to an end of the Geneva assembly. Thus, this is a neutral source to some extent but one that clearly has sympathy with the British and their ‘dilemma’.</i> Source B: <i>This is a British cartoon which is clearly trying to satirise the leaders of both Italy and France and imply that Britain acted in a more ‘noble’ fashion. It is possible to suggest that this was not the case as Britain continually displayed self interest in disputes.</i> Source C: <i>is a speech by Mussolini to the Italian Senate in 1923. He is seeking to justify Italian military action in Corfu and undermine the position of the League of Nations which criticised that action. It is a useful source in that it clearly portrays the ideas that Mussolini used to justify his actions, but it is not a reliable representation of the rest of the League.</i> Source D: <i>Briand was speaking in 1926, the year when the Briand-Kellogg Pact was signed, a treaty to end war. Both Briand and Nansen recognised that the members could do more to put the interest of the League above national interests. They are realistic in seeing the shortcomings. However, this is a speech which is designed to defend and prop up the League of Nations so can’t be taken as a reliable account of its actions.</i>	