



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY**9389/13**

Paper 1

May/June 2021**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 May/June 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **10** 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 attitudes towards papal authority shown in Sources C and D. Similarities. - There are three main similarities. The first is that both Sources accept that there will be a future role for the Pope in both Rome and Italy as a whole. - The second is that the Pope should retain his spiritual leadership over the Roman Catholic Church. - The third is that there should in future be a clear division between the Pope's spiritual leadership of the Church and any political leadership. Formerly the Pope had been the political leader of the Papal States. It was accepted in both Sources that the Papacy would no longer be a Head of State with any civil authority. Differences - The main difference is one of tone and attitude towards the Papacy. Source C is very positive and supportive of the Papacy. It wants to retain the 'true independence' of the Pope and clearly values the Pope's spiritual authority. It wants to retain 'the dignity and independence' of the Papacy and wants to 'safeguard' it. Source D is highly critical of the Papacy. It sees it as a weak institution, controlling a region which is the centre for plots and violence which 'condemns' its citizens to 'idleness' and a lack of economic and intellectual progress. It sees the institution as a threat to peace. Source C is a public speech by Cavour who is appealing to the new Italian Parliament over the management of a highly complex problem. Italy was still a strongly Catholic country, so he had to retain Catholic support. However, at the same time there were plenty in both the new Parliament and Italy generally who saw the Pope as a tyrant because of the way in which the Papal States had been ruled. Cavour was trying to steer a middle way between two extremes. Source D is a letter which was not intended to be published. Therefore, it might well contain views which would not be put forward in parliament and be a more accurate reflection of official thinking than would be the case in a parliamentary speech like Source C.	15

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	‘Regionalism was the main problem facing those desiring Italian unity.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? Source A can be used to challenge. The writer suggests that Sicily should reject regionalism, be happy to join with the rest of Italy and that ‘annexation means order and justice’. The writer appears much more worried about a Bourbon invasion or the threat of republicanism. They also suggest that Victor Emmanuel should be trusted. Some support could be read against the grain as this may be a response to others worried about joining a united Italy, but this source is generally in favour of unification. <i>Source A is simply a newspaper comment and there is no indication how popular these views might be in Sicily. Contextual knowledge might suggest that the chances of a Bourbon restoration were slight, and there was no republican tradition in the region either.</i> Source B supports the hypothesis and raises the issue of regionalism, seeing this as an important issue. The speaker argues against Sicily giving up its legal system, which is ‘the best in all of Italy’ and handing itself over to a new country which has not got one, has no settled government, and refers to the ‘disorder’ in the South. There is no mention of the capital issue for example. <i>The speaker, evidently part of the representation of Sicily in the new Italian Parliament, would naturally be inclined to favour the current practices of the region he was elected from. However contextual knowledge would suggest that while possibly exaggerating the situation that existed in Italy at the time, there were many valid concerns across the ‘new’ Italy about the extent to which local laws, customs and practices would have to change as a result of unification and forming a truly national government.</i> Source C challenges this hypothesis, and initially has a focus on where the capital should be. It is an important one, but there were several others of even greater importance. French support was still an issue at the time, as Austria was still a significant feature in North Italy. The whole relationship between Church and State needed to be sorted out, with the Pope being distinctly unhappy over the whole idea of the separation of powers. The capital issue was important, but it was far and away from being the only one. There is no mention of any regional issues. <i>Cavour is appealing to the new Italian Parliament over the management of a highly complex problem, and this is bound to affect what he says. Italy was still a strongly Catholic country, so he had to retain Catholic support. However, at the same time there were plenty in both the new Parliament and Italy generally who saw the Pope as a tyrant because of the way in which the Papal States had been ruled. Cavour was trying to steer a middle way between two extremes.</i>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	Source D also suggests that the issue of the capital is important and has to be dealt with, but, like Source C, suggests there are other problems as well. These include the hostility of the Papacy to both the separation of powers and the loss of its civil authority. There are also the references to the plots against the new Italian government. The feeling is that the issue of the role of the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church is more important. There is little comment on any regional issues. <i>While Source C is a public speech, Source D is a letter which was not intended to be published. Therefore, it might well contain views which would not be put forward in parliament and be a more accurate reflection of official thinking than would be the case in a parliamentary speech like Source C.</i> <i>Contextual knowledge, as well as Cavour's own private letters in the weeks before he died suggest that his real views were similar to those expressed in Source D.</i>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	To what extent do Sources B and D agree about Northern views on the election campaign? Agreements/Similarities include: - Both emphasise the discontent of the South - Both stress the determination of the South to oppose Lincoln. Disagreements/Differences include: Source B says Southern discontent is a response to Lincoln and Seward spreading alarm whereas Source D says 'a group of leading men of the South' is responsible. Source B says the Republicans will be most effectively stopped by the conservative men of the middle and northern states whereas Source D says that the Republicans will not be stopped because Southern discontent has helped provoke Northern opposition – and presumably unity – against the South. <i>Source B comes from a contemporary Northern newspaper while Source D comes from an autobiography published more than twenty-five years later. The author of Source D was the leading ex-slave of the era, who played a major role in the process of emancipation. Therefore, his account of the election campaign is likely to be sympathetic to the Republicans, especially two decades later. [At the time Douglass was more critical.] Source B, written in the heat of the political battle, is unlikely to be impartial. However, before reaching its anti-Lincoln conclusion, it is even-handed in criticising both the South and the Republican leaders. And the conclusion is surprising, coming from a New York newspaper. Both sources are partial and thus unreliable.</i>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	‘The 1860 Presidential election united the South in favour of secession.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? Source A challenges the assertion. It argues that ‘it would be unwise for the Southern states to secede’ before going on to give evidence to support its argument. <i>Source A is an appeal for moderation from a Southern source, though from one of the border slave states rather than the Deep South. It is from a letter which was published, presumably to influence opinion in Kentucky in favour of Breckinridge. This letter runs counter to the usual views of the South and of Southern Democrats. And evidence can be provided of Southerners who opposed secession.</i> Source B supports the hypothesis. It argues that the South is united by ‘a spirit of resistance’ against a likely Republican victory. The South, however, cannot stop a Lincoln victory. Doing so depends on men of moderation in the North. <i>Published in a New York newspaper in the middle of the election campaign, this Northern source is convincing in its analysis of the South – and of the election. The South by itself could not defeat Lincoln. The Northern men of moderation which Source B urged to vote against Lincoln did not do so in sufficient numbers. Therefore, the source is reliable in its argument about the 1860 election and its impact on the South.</i> Source C challenges the hypothesis as it doesn’t actually say that the 1860 election did unite the South. Rather, it said that the likely election result should unite the South in such a circumstance, in a conference of all the states. The Governor of Louisiana wants unity to avoid secession, not bring it about. <i>Source C is written just before the presidential election result is announced. It is a public document from the Governor of Louisiana, who rather disingenuously argues that he is speaking only for himself. As an elected politician, he is both influenced by and tries to influence public opinion, aiming to appeal to as many voters as possible. As a public document from an elected politician at such a crucial time, this is hardly likely to be a reliable account of Southern responses to the 1860 election.</i> Source D challenges the assertion. Its main message is that the election of 1860 saw voters divide into three groups: secessionists, sceptics about Southern threats and opponents of the South and its threats. The secessionists are identified as ‘a group of leading men of the South’. It suggests that Southern threats might have united Northern opposition. <i>Source D is taken from Douglass’s autobiography, published several decades after the election. Given events of those two decades, and especially the civil war and its outcomes, its reliability with regards to the attitudes of the South in 1860 is highly dubious.</i>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	To what extent do Sources B and D agree about the weaknesses of the League of Nations? Differences include: • There are differences over what its weaknesses were. Source B suggests that these included: the fact that its decisions had to be unanimous and the fact that it was not organised on a federal system, while Source D thinks that the system of sanctions was far too slow. • Source B also singles out Britain for particular criticism. Source D does not do this, suggesting it was let down by many nations. Similarities include: • Both sources agree that member states have shown insufficient support to the League. Source B is written from the perspective of 1941 and so the author knows about the failure of the League. The author is also an anti-fascist and so was keen for the League to stand up to Italy, Japan and Germany. He wants to explain the failures of the League. Source D is from the final session of the League in 1946. The purpose was to liquidate the League. It was a form of handing on to the UN. The members tended to look back and, despite the Second World War, try to remember positive aspects of the League. It is also trying to be hopeful about the new UN. All this colours the judgement of the author.	15

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	'The League of Nations achieved little.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? Source A makes the crucial point that the League failed to secure peace and prevent war. It failed because it was asked to do too much. <i>Source A is from Neville Chamberlain, a leading member of the British Government. It is made just after the Abyssinian Crisis where the British Government was not keen on using sanctions or on taking a strong stand against Italy. In fact, Britain was a less than enthusiastic member of the League, and its lack of commitment to the League is reflected in this source. This explains Chamberlain's purpose and argument. He does not want Britain to rely on the League again. It also explains his low expectations of the League.</i> Source B makes the point that the main reason for the League's existence was to preserve peace, and in this it failed. This makes the failure more significant. The areas in which it did succeed were not as important. It also mentions that the League was often paralysed, and it often had to resort to compromises. Source B offers some challenge as, although it thinks the failures were more significant, does mention some achievements – in the 'non-political' field such as public health and the opium trade. <i>Source B is written from the perspective of 1941 and so the author knows about the failure of the League. The author is also an anti-fascist and so was keen for the League to stand up to Italy, Japan and Germany. He wants to explain the failures of the League.</i> Source C also makes the point that the League failed to preserve peace which was the reason for its existence and concludes at the end that it 'failed'. However, Source C challenges the idea because it disagrees strongly. It argues that there were achievements in social, economic and humanitarian areas. More importantly it says that the fact that this was the first organisation set up to abolish war and preserve peace was an important achievement in itself. The ideals it had have been preserved and will live on through the UN – again, an important achievement. <i>Source C is by Lord Cecil. As one of the founders of the League he tends to be more positive towards it than some of the other authors. He is also looking forward to the UN. All this rather colours his judgements about the League. It also raises questions about his claim that there was little wrong with the Covenant and that any problems were the fault of the member countries.</i>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	Source D mentions that in the case of Italy sanctions failed. It also implies at the beginning that there was a failure, but this was not the fault of the League. However, Source D offers some challenge to the idea because it makes similar points about the legacy of the League – its achievements in public health and social issues live on into the future, as do its ideals. These will be taken up by the UN and will help the UN. These are important achievements. <i>Source D is from the final session of the League in 1946. The purpose was to liquidate the League. It was a form of handing on to the UN. The members tended to look back and, despite the Second World War, try to remember positive aspects of the League. It is also trying to be hopeful about the new UN. All this colours the judgement of the author.</i>	