



Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY**9389/12**

Paper 1 Document Question

October/November 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 October/November 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 views of Bismarck's policies in Sources C and D Similarities: - Both Sources suggest that there is flexibility and a willingness to adapt in Bismarck's policies. - They both indicate that Bismarck is, or intends to be, expansionist in approach. Source C refers to the 'Prussian policy of expansion' while Source D refers to the annexation of the Duchies. - Both suggest that Bismarck could be very secretive in his approach with Source D referring to his possible 'cynical plotting' and 'deception', not dissimilar to the points that the Crown Prince makes in Source C. Differences: - Possibly the biggest difference is that of tone, with Source C being strongly critical of Bismarck's policies and the way he executes them. Source D is clearly enthusiastic about Bismarck's policies and their outcome. There is admiration there. Source D also suggests that there might be a plan in Bismarck's mind, but is not convinced that there was one but Source C criticises Bismarck for the lack of a fixed programme. Source C also argues that Bismarck's policies are politically damaging and not only will they cause problems with the rest of Europe for Prussia but will lead to her isolation, whereas Source D seems to suggest the outcome is power on the European stage. <i>Source C is from the Crown Prince who was a known critic of Bismarck, but at the same time was knowledgeable and well informed about all matters in Prussia and Germany. It is an important source by someone involved in decision making, and the date it was written is particularly important. The author of Source D was writing after both the successful wars against the Danes and the Austrians, with Bismarck very much the dominant political force in Prussia. He has the advantage of some hindsight and is perhaps imposing his own views on the subject after the event. Contextual knowledge and Bismarck's later work would suggest that his interpretation of events is probably correct. How close to the actual decision making the author of this interpretation is, is not known, however.</i>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	'Denmark caused the Schleswig-Holstein crisis.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? Source A very much supports this view by mentioning that the Duchies were armed, and hostilities were only being prevented by the joint actions of the Swedes and the Prussians. The author makes it very clear that the Danes are out to provoke conflict, and, while gaining the support of other European powers, impose their rule on the Duchies. The whole focus of the Source is highly critical of the Danes. <i>It should be noted that the author is a German historian and possibly very much in support of the idea of absorbing the Duchies into Prussia or Germany. Palmerston, the British Foreign Secretary at the time, was known to be an expert on European affairs, and seen to be a major influence in international affairs at the time, as well as being interested in the Duchies' fate.</i> Source B does not support the hypothesis and suggests that it is a much broader issue that is behind the crisis. It not only is linked to internal politics (the author is from Bavaria, a state in southern Germany), but also a question of rights and the existence of the smaller German states. It is a small link in a much bigger chain of events. <i>Hohenlohe is an important figure in German politics in the period and would be well aware of the broader implications of the Schleswig-Holstein issue, and his views are significant and valid. Writing in his diary would indicate this represents his own views and there is no apparent need to try and influence anyone.</i> Source C does not support the hypothesis, with the opinion of the Crown Prince that there ought to be no fixed view, and that events (presumably the implications of the death of the King of Denmark) should dictate policy. No blame for the crisis is attributed. Prussia might just take advantage of what others are doing but would not be seen as a causative factor of the crisis. However, the comment about Bismarck's 'secret intention' might suggest that Bismarck's machinations were inflammatory and therefore Prussia could be seen as a cause of the crisis. <i>The Crown Prince was of course a known critic of Bismarck, but at the same time knowledgeable and well informed about all matters in Prussia and Germany as a whole. It is an important source by someone involved in decision making, and the date it was written is particularly important.</i> Source D does not support the hypothesis. The author suggests that while the death of the Danish King triggered the crisis, this did not cause it. Bamberger places the blame for the whole crisis firmly at Bismarck's feet, and he used it not only to annex the Duchies, but also to undermine the Germany princes.	25

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<i>The author was writing after both the successful wars against the Danes and the Austrians, with Bismarck very much the dominant political force in Prussia. He has the advantage of some hindsight and is perhaps imposing his own views on the subject after the event. Contextual knowledge and Bismarck's later work would suggest that his interpretation of events is probably correct. How close to the to the actual decision making the author of this interpretation is, is not known, however.</i>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Compare and contrast Sources A and C as evidence of Northern views of the Supreme Court. Similarities include: • Both agree that the Supreme Court is important to US politics and government. Differences include: • Source A sees the Supreme Court as dominated by Southern interests whereas Source C sees it as apolitical and independent • Source A says the Supreme Court needs to be challenged whereas Source C says it should not be challenged. <i>Both sources come from New York newspapers and are rapid responses to the Dred Scott judgement. Which is the more reliable expression of Northern views? Source A considers the political context of the judgment while Source C focuses more on the theory of the constitution to dismiss the unidentified critics of the judgement. Source A is the more useful, if no more reliable</i>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	‘The Dred Scott judgement was accepted as final.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view? Analysis and Evaluation: Source A challenges the assertion. It argues that the Dred Scott judgement was only temporary because it was made by a partial Supreme Court and would cause much opposition in the free states. <i>Source A is the view of the judgement made by a leading Northern – and the leading abolitionist – newspaper of the time. It was bound to oppose the Dred Scott judgement, thus making the judgement far from final. As a statement of Northern views, Source A is both accurate and reliable.</i> Source B supports the hypothesis when it argues that opponents of the judgement will have to accept the legal ruling of the highest court in the land. Even opponents must accept that the law is superior to politics. <i>This Georgian newspaper bases its argument on some generalisations about Northern opinions, e.g. that the law-abiding men of the North will prevail over the leaders of the Black Republican party. This is wishful thinking based on no solid evidence, if only because the editorial being written soon after the Dred Scott judgement. Though Source C provides some support for Source B, Source A undermines it. Therefore, Source B’s support for the assertion is unreliable.</i> Source C also supports the hypothesis. Its arguments match those of Source B: political opposition to the Dred Scott judgement must give way to the rule of law. <i>Source C is a Northern source, which makes its assessment of Northern public opinion more reliable than Source B, if not Source A. Source C’s coverage of Northern politics is minimal, which makes it unreliable in its arguments.</i> Source D challenges the hypothesis. Douglass argues that though Dred Scott is a setback for the abolitionist cause, it is only a temporary setback. The free states would not accept the ‘open and scandalous tissue of lies’ that is the judgement. If anything, such a judgement should galvanise opposition to slave-owners. <i>Source D is taken from a public speech to an abolitionist meeting by Douglass several months after the Dred Scott judgement. It is an emotional attack upon the Supreme Court, presumably made to try and enthuse his audience to political action. It shows the depth of Northern feeling against Dred Scott and is reliable in challenging the assertion.</i>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	To what extent do Sources A and D agree about Italy? Disagreements include: • Source A is a French account describing the Italians in friendly terms while Source D says that France is nervous about falling out with Italy. • Source A describes the Italians as desiring peace while Source D describes them as potentially threatening and aggressive. • In Source A Italy is a country which needs to be appeased. In Source D Italy is a country that should not be feared. Countries should stand up to it. Agreements include: • Source A does recognise there have been differences with Italy and there are clearly differences with Italy in Source D. • France is wary of Italy in both sources. • Britain and France both want to be involved in the situation with Italy. <i>Source A is Laval speaking to the League trying to persuade them of France's loyalty to the League when French actions may suggest something else. France was desperate to placate Italy. Source D is from Hoare's resignation speech, so he is trying to justify his actions and involvement in the Hoare-Laval Pact which went against British public opinion and was disowned by his own government.</i>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	'The League was undermined by Britain and France.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? Source A has evidence of France acting outside the League – meetings in January, meeting in Stresa leading to the Stresa Front (which included Britain) which led to Mussolini thinking that Britain and France would oppose intervention in Abyssinia. France prepared to 'satisfy Italy's legitimate aspirations'. Source A also challenges the idea because it makes many protestations of loyalty to the League. Does say it will not agree anything with Italy that is incompatible with sovereignty of members of the League. Source A is Laval speaking to the League trying to persuade them of France's loyalty to the League when French actions may suggest something else. France was desperate to placate Italy. Source B Britain claims loyalty to the League. Promises not to take action outside the League. Source B is from the election manifesto of the National Government in Britain and unsurprisingly declares its loyalty to the League when British public opinion at this time was very much pro-League. There is therefore some doubt about the promises it makes about the League. Britain was also very keen to keep on good terms with Italy. Source C shows Abyssinia complaining about the Hoare-Laval Pact and Britain and France as members of the League acting outside the League in secret. Source C sees Abyssinia complaining about the secret Hoare-Laval Pact which, without the knowledge of Abyssinia and the League, awarded Italy Abyssinian territory. It is not surprising that Abyssinia, as a member of the League, was not pleased. Source D Hoare admits to acting with France outside the League. He also suggests that Britain was not happy to support League sanctions on oil. Source D also offers some challenge when Hoare claims to have acted to prevent 'the dissolution of the League' and to protect League sanctions. Source D is from Hoare's resignation speech, so he is trying to justify his actions and involvement in the Hoare-Laval Pact which went against British public opinion and was disowned by his own government.	25