

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2015 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/12

Paper 1 (Document Question), maximum raw mark 40

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	12

Generic levels of response

Part (a)

Level 4: Makes a developed comparison [12–15]

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.

Level 3: Compares views and identifies similarities *and* differences [8–11]

Compares the views expressed in the sources, identifying differences and similarities. Begins to explain and evaluate the views using the sources and knowledge.

Level 2: Compares views and identifies similarities *and/or* differences [4–7]

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.

Level 1: Describes content of each source [1–3]

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.

Level 0: No relevant comment on the sources or the issue [0]

Part (b)

Level 5: Evaluates the sources to reach a sustained judgement [21–25]

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.

Level 4: Evaluates the sources [16–20]

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.

Level 3: Uses the sources to support *and* challenge the statement [11–15]

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.

Level 2: Uses the sources to support *or* challenge the statement [6–10]

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.

Level 1: Does not make valid use of the sources [1–5]

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.

Level 0: No relevant comment on the sources or the issue [0]

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	12

Section A: European Option

Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1848–1871

Bismarck, war and unification

- 1 (a) To what extent do Sources A and B agree about Bismarck's attitude towards France? [15]

Indicative content

There are areas of both agreement and disagreement. The sources are sympathetic to France. They both show a reluctance to go to war with France. They disagree in that Source B sees war with France as more likely than does Source A. Source B expects war to happen 'before long' whereas Source A says that peace should last for 10–15 years, by which time France will have got used to a united Germany and, presumably, war will be unnecessary. Only if France upsets German feelings, according to Source B, might Germany consider war – which is what happened in 1870, if with Bismarck's help. It is worth noting the very different audiences that Bismarck was addressing. While war is not ruled out in A, Bismarck does wish to appear conciliatory. He presents his generals as being aggressive. He was trying his hardest to prevent any conflict. He argued that it would be highly damaging to both countries and would probably just lead to further wars. The general impression is that of a peace-lover/maker. Source B is more pessimistic about the likelihood of war and while there are the obvious fears, with the reference to the 'flower of our youth struck down', the final sentence about 'the most vital interests of the Fatherland' requiring war could well be seen as preparing the ground for the future. The difference can be explained by the different audiences Bismarck is addressing: to the British journalist, in Source A, Bismarck is the European statesman; to the Prussian politician, Bismarck is a German nationalist. Neither source is to be trusted.

- (b) 'Bismarck did not want to use war to achieve German unification.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]

Context: By 1867, Bismarck had been the Prussian Prime Minister for five years. In that time Prussia had fought two wars: Denmark in 1864, Austria in 1866. He was to fight a third, against France, in 1870–1. In 1867 he established the North German Confederation, a slimmed-down *Kleindeutschland*. The complete version, accomplished in 1871, would fully incorporate the states of southern Germany: Baden, Bavaria and Württemberg. His famous quote about the big issues of the day being decided by 'blood and iron' gave rise to the belief that Bismarck was prepared to use war in order to achieve his goals and especially the expansion of Prussia. War with France was possible as the rise of a united Germany on France's eastern borders was regarded by many as a threat to French prestige and power. In 1870 Bismarck seemed to manipulate France into a war which Prussia won, thereby completing the unification of Germany. Three wars in eight years would suggest that Bismarck was prepared to use war to unify Germany.

Analysis: Note that the question applies to the use of war in general and not just one specific war. Source A supports the assertion, at least with regard to any forthcoming war with France. Bismarck claims to have acted as a restraint upon Prussian generals, who had shown they were prepared to go to war with France in the spring of 1867. Source B shows a similar reluctance to fight France. In both cases, however, Bismarck qualifies his antipathy to war: in Source A war might be necessary in order to ensure that German feelings are respected; in Source B it's the 'vital interests of the Fatherland' which might necessitate war. Source C is Bismarck putting the case for the relatively lenient treatment of Austria in 1866. Here Bismarck is arguing not against going to war but against fighting a prolonged war, even if victorious. Source D approaches the issue in an indirect way. It states that Bismarck has 'a rare capacity for planning', which presumably can mean planning for war. Thus Source D can

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	12

be seen as opposing the assertion that Bismarck did not want to use war. Two sources support the assertion, the third is neutral and the fourth opposed.

Evaluation: The reliability of all four sources can be seriously questioned. Source A is an interview with a foreign journalist. We do not know whether the interview was published. Even so, it would be used to inform British newspaper articles. The reference to generals in the spring is presumably an allusion to the Luxembourg crisis, which involved diplomatic tensions between Prussia and France and talk of war. Bismarck would be keen to reduce tensions so soon after the war with Austria and a new German state to be established. He would want to reassure the British journalist that he was not thinking of going to war. Source B was a private letter to a fellow right wing German politician, written in March 1867. At that time, the North German Confederation was being established, which was no time for foreign adventures. Source C is from Bismarck's memoirs, which are notoriously unreliable and self-serving. Everything Bismarck writes need careful testing against the evidence. In this instance, the evidence suggests Bismarck is more reliable than usual. Prussia did avoid wounding Austria too severely. Prussia/Germany and Austria did become friends again, in 1879, as part of the chess of European politics. Source D, a paean of praise for Bismarck, was written by a supporter in 1866, the year of the war with Austria. It is hardly going to be an assessment of the man which strives for objectivity. And all the time, contextual knowledge works to undermine the assertion that Bismarck did not want to use war to achieve German unification – even if the goal of his willingness to use war might be questioned. Was it the unification of Germany or the expansion of Prussia which Bismarck sought?

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	12

Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

The Freeport Debate between Lincoln and Douglas 1858

- 2 (a) **Compare and contrast the accounts of the Freeport meeting given by Sources B and D.** [15]

Indicative content

The two sources are similar in that they both see Lincoln as winning the debate with Senator Douglas. Source B describes a very large meeting in which Lincoln demolished the arguments of Douglas so thoroughly that Douglas supporters left the meeting in a demoralised state. Source D makes no mention of the size of the audience – which is a difference of detail – but is equally convinced about the superiority of Lincoln over Douglas. Another difference of detail is that Source B makes no comparison of the physique and speaking style of the two men while Source D spends some time contrasting the both. A third difference is that Source D concentrates on his own response to the two speakers and their speeches, making no mention of the audience, while Source B does the exact opposite. The difference is due mainly to the contrasting origins of the two sources: Source B is a contemporary newspaper report, Source D an autobiographical account written more than half a century later. The difference raises questions about the relative reliability of the two sources.

- (b) **How far do Sources A to D support the view that, in the debates with Douglas in 1858, Lincoln showed all the talents needed to be a leader of the new Republican party?** [25]

Context: The Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858 were debates between the Republican and Democratic candidates to become US Senator for the state of Illinois. Lincoln was the challenger, Douglas the incumbent. Senator Douglas was one of the national leaders of the Democratic Party and the leading advocate of popular sovereignty – also known as squatter sovereignty – a concept which attempted to defuse the issue of slavery in the territories. Lincoln was little known outside the Midwest. Times were turbulent. Slavery was become more of a national issue following the Dred Scott judgement and ‘Bloody Kansas’. The seven debates, which attracted national as well as local attention, reflected this concern with slavery. They made Lincoln a national figure, even though he lost the ‘election’ to be a US Senator – narrowly – to Douglas. The Freeport debate has been described by Allan Nevins as ‘the most momentous of all the debates’ between the two men. In the months before the debate Lincoln had made his ‘house divided’ speech, which also gained him a lot of attention. By the end of the contest, Lincoln had emerged as a national figure, a prospective candidate for President.

Analysis: Source A is a journalist’s report of the appearance of Douglas and Lincoln at the very first of their seven debates. It draws a clear and vivid contrast between the physical appearances of the two men before finishing with praise for Lincoln’s qualities as a debater. Thus Source A shows that Lincoln has the talents and skills needed to lead the Republican Party to electoral victory. Source B supports Source A. It argues that Lincoln ‘utterly demolished’ Douglas in the debate at Freeport. Source C is not convinced. It describes how Lincoln’s speech disappointed his supporters, which suggests that Lincoln lacked the qualities needed to win elections. Source D is the third which argues for Lincoln’s potential as a party leader. It argues that Lincoln’s speech had a broad appeal which Douglas’s lacked. In addition, Douglas was narrowly and aggressively sectional. Though no direct contrast is made with Lincoln on the matter of style, the implication is that Lincoln was the opposite:

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	12

bipartisan, reasonable and rational. The author of Source E certainly saw Lincoln as the ‘champion’ of the Republican Party. Sources A and B supported him, if less enthusiastically.

Evaluation: The four sources were all written by people who attended the Lincoln-Douglas debates. One reported the first debate, three the second. Three were adult journalists, one retired professor aged 73. All are partisan. All can be doubted. All three pieces of journalism are less than reliable. Two – Sources B and C – contradict each other so completely that you wonder if they were reporting the same meeting. They could be seen as cancelling each other out. Both are exaggerating, probably to appeal to the readers of their respective papers. Source A is a little more even-handed but then it does not comment on the content of the debate, unlike Sources B and C. Source D is perhaps the most intriguing. It is taken from a letter written almost seventy years after the debate. The author was fourteen in 1858, which makes him seventy-three when he wrote his reminiscence of the event. How much reliability can be placed on such a memoir, especially given the glorification of Lincoln in the intervening years? His assessment of Douglas is supported by Source A, which helps make Source D a little more reliable but his view of Douglas again might be a reflection of the historical view developed since the civil war. Thus the sources are of limited reliability. Context needs to be considered to help decide which is the most reliable. We do know that following these debates Lincoln did become a national figure and that within two years he was nominated as the Republican Party’s candidate for US president. Sources A and D certainly stress Lincoln’s ability as an election speaker for the new Republican party. Whether that skill was all that was needed to lead the party is another matter. Thus the quote could be modified to say that Lincoln showed the talents to lead the Republican Party to electoral victory.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	12

Section C: International Option

The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

The League of Nations and the World Disarmament Conference, 1932–33

- 3 (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of the USA's attitude towards the World Disarmament Conference. [15]

Indicative content

Source A suggests that the USA was not prepared to compromise. It was determined to maintain a large fleet of aircraft carriers, battleships and submarines. The USA justified this by arguing that it needed a large fleet to protect its overseas interests. They also argued that Britain had the right to maintain a large fleet to protect its Empire. The source makes it clear that other countries were angered by this uncooperative attitude. Conversely, Source B suggests that the USA was keen for the Conference to make effective decisions leading to the reduction of armaments. The source refers to the decisions made as '*substantial achievements*'. It is clear from the use of language that the US Representative was pleased with the progress which had been made at the Conference. Source A comes from a newspaper report, intended for an American audience, of the Conference. The USA had not joined the League of Nations and was not bound by Article 8 of its Covenant. However, the USA's approach could be seen as consistent with Article 8. The US Representative argues that America's national safety required it to be able to defend its overseas possessions. There is an indication that the USA was prepared to compromise; '*unless the Conference abolishes submarines altogether*' implies that the USA would not maintain a fleet of big submarines if other countries would agree to get rid of theirs. Source B comes from a press release issued by the same US Representative whose seemingly uncooperative stance was reported on in Source A. This was intended for a wider audience than Source A, and Swanson wanted to demonstrate to the world that the USA was keen to support the aims of the Disarmament Conference. As a result, he stresses the achievements made by the Conference despite the difficult circumstances in which it was held, and creates the impression that the USA was a keen supporter of arms limitation. Note that the statement was released at an interim stage of the Conference, which was due to re-convene in January 1933. Tentative agreements and pledges had been made but no decisions had been taken.

- (b) 'Nobody really wanted it to succeed.' How far do Sources A to D support this view of the World Disarmament Conference? [25]

Context: The Treaty of Versailles imposed arms reductions on Germany and implied that other countries would also reduce armaments. Article 8 of the League of Nations' Covenant committed member states to arms reduction: *The Members of the League recognise that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations.* Apart from Germany, no other country had complied, a cause of major resentment. Most continued to increase expenditure on armaments. For example, Britain argued that it needed to protect its Empire; France, concerned about a possible German revival, claimed security reasons; the USA, not committed to either the Treaty or the League, wanted to protect and extend its Pacific interests. The World Disarmament Conference was designed to enforce the pledges made in 1919–1920. It was held against a background of world economic problems, political tensions, issues over reparations and war debts and Japanese aggression against China. Unsurprisingly, national interests held sway and no meaningful decisions were made. Hitler used this as the pretext for withdrawing Germany from both the Conference and the League, and the excuse for embarking on the re-armament of Germany.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9389	12

Analysis: Source A indicates that the USA was putting its own interests above its international responsibilities to help reduce armaments. It is highly likely that other countries would adopt the same attitude, making it difficult for decisions to be made. Source B suggests there were limitations to what the Conference achieved in that some delegates believed that the draft resolution '*did not go far enough*'. The source was written at an interim stage of the Conference, by which time only draft proposals had been made and nothing definitive had been agreed. Source C implies that the Conference was a complete failure and achieved nothing. The national representatives (on stage) are depicted as aggressive and uncompromising. The cartoonist suggests that world opinion was in favour of arms reduction and wanted the Conference to succeed and that it was the ineptitude of the politicians which caused its failure. Just as the cartoon (C) has the caption '*The Conference excuses itself*', Source D reads like a series of excuses for the Conference failing to make progress. The source argues that there was a lack of mutual trust between national representatives and that they all put their own interests above their international obligations. The implication is that nothing was achieved as a result. This is particularly evident from the statement that members of the League, a year before the Conference opened, stressed the need for pre-negotiations, yet '*little or nothing was done*'. Countries were prepared to talk in favour of arms limitation, but were not prepared to do anything about it. This suggests that the draft agreements made during the first phase of the Conference eventually came to nothing. On the other hand, Source B lists a number of significant issues over which agreement was reached in principle during the first phase of the Conference. That so many countries were prepared to meet to discuss issues of arms reduction could be seen as an achievement. There is some evidence that countries were prepared to compromise e.g. the implication in Source A that the USA would remove its submarines if other countries did the same. Source D implies that more substantial progress might have been made if circumstances had been better. The implication is that progress might be made in the future when circumstances have improved.

Evaluation: Source A was written for a US audience. Since the Conference was still in session when the source was written, it cannot comment on its eventual outcome. By inference, however, it is clear that the USA was determined to protect its own national interests and it is likely that other countries would do the same. The source reports on events without making judgements. Source B was written for release to the world's press at the end of the first phase of the Conference. It cannot comment on the final outcome of the Conference, merely on the tentative agreements reached at the end of the first phase. There was considerable interest in the Conference world-wide, with public opinion desperate for it to succeed in the hope it would prevent another war. The US Representative wanted to show that the USA was in favour of reaching important decisions about arms reduction and to speak positively about the Conference's progress. While Source C is based on the opinions of the artist, it also reflects British public opinion which wanted the Conference to succeed. The cartoon is critical of the politicians who represented their countries at the Conference. As the official report, Source D wished to explain why the Conference failed to make substantial progress on the issue of arms reduction. Therefore, it lists the factors which led to the Conference's failure.