Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

HISTORY **9389/12**

Paper 1 Document Question 12 **May/June 2020**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

Published

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

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 B and D as evidence about Bismarck's attitude towards Austria.** In **Source B** Bismarck's attitude is quite positive towards Austria. He seems to see Austria as a fellow supporter of the monarchic principle and there is also the reference to the 'bond' between the two nations. He suggests that Austria shares his support for conservatism. He seems to see Austria as an ally and hopes she will support him in his policies. However, aspects of the source suggest that he is not totally convinced that Austria will support him unreservedly. There is a note of caution there. It was intended to be a confidential document, and Bismarck is clearly trying to get pressure put on Austria to follow his ideas. The source does give a good picture of Bismarck's attitude and thinking. **Source D** shows a very different picture of Bismarckian thinking. It mentions his 'old rival', and indicates that Bismarck was simply giving the impression of friendship and common purpose in order to get Austrian support for his attack on Denmark. The source also mentions that Bismarck was cleverly playing on Austria's friendly feeling towards him. He was taking advantage of how his conservative policy was being favourably received in Vienna. It is the final sentence that makes it clear what Bismarck's real attitude was towards Austria in the author's mind. He sees Austria as a hostile power which can be led in the direction he wants. *It would be expected that **Source B** was both an accurate and reliable picture of Bismarck's thinking, given that it is a confidential document to a key figure in the relationship between Austria and Prussia. However, Bismarck may have been anxious to hide his real ideas to ensure that the ambassador really conveyed the message to Austria that he wanted.* ***Source D** is a contemporary biography on the life of Bismarck, published when Bismarck was very much the dominant figure in Prussian politics. It is quite critical and shows some balance. Obviously, we do not know how well researched it was, or how much the author knew about what was going on. Contextual knowledge would suggest it is a pretty astute piece of writing, particularly in the light of the build-up to the war against France. Bismarck could be very devious in his methods.*	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**'The Schleswig-Holstein question was solely a dispute between Prussia and Denmark.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?** **Source A agrees** with the hypothesis. The source is focussed on the disagreements between Prussia and Denmark over the issue of Schleswig-Holstein. It accuses Denmark of attempting to 'withdraw from its duties towards Germany' and characterises the dispute as a struggle for 'freedom against foreign domination'. *We might expect this view from a group of Conservative Deputies in the Prussian Landtag as they are on the side of Bismarck and Prussia in the early days of this dispute. It is clear they are attempting to blame Denmark for the issues that have arisen.* **Source B does not support** the hypothesis. Bismarck suggests that the dispute is part of the wider fight of monarchies against European revolution. Also it mentions unity with Austria and what is happening in Vienna. Therefore Austria is involved in what Bismarck portrays as this wider European fight. *We might expect Bismarck to suggest that there is a higher purpose to his quarrel with Denmark than land and power. This is clearly an attempt to bring Austrian power into the situation. The war with Denmark had begun in Feb 1864 and so this is a call to arms by Bismarck.* **Source C does not support** the hypothesis. The source mentions that Austria will be given rights and will cede rights to Prussia. Thus, we can infer this involved Prussia and Austria as well as Denmark. The treaty details the ceding of the Duchy of Lauenburg to Prussia. *This was the official treaty signed by Prussia and Austria after the Second Schleswig War. As such, it shows that both Prussia and Austria had interests in the region and divided power between them after the defeat of Denmark.* **Source D largely does not support** the hypothesis. The source talks about Austrian involvement in the Second Schleswig War which challenges the idea that this was just a dispute between Denmark and Prussia. However, **it does support** the assertion to a certain extent because it suggests it was a mystery why Austria was involved because really it was just Prussia's interests. *This later biography of Bismarck is perhaps designed to over-emphasise his genius. Although it seemed to many that Prussia had the main interest in the war, parts of the region had traditionally been included in the Holy Roman Empire which Austria saw as their territory. What this does demonstrate is that many of the conflicts that Bismarck was involved in were about wider issues than just particular pieces of land.*	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Compare and contrast the views of the Missouri Compromise shown in Sources A and B.** **Similarities** include: • **Source A** quotes the Missouri Compromise as limiting the freedom of citizens to establish slavery in the Kansas-Nebraska Territory and **Source B** asserts the same. • Both agree that the Missouri Compromise will be overturned by the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. **Differences** include: • **Source A** is **opposed** to the ending of the Missouri Compromise while **Source B** is **justifying its exclusion** from the Kansas-Nebraska Act. • **Source A** sees the withdrawal of the Missouri Compromise as **ending** freedom while **Source B** argues it will **enhance the freedom** of the people of Kansas-Nebraska. ***Source A** is a speech by a leading abolitionist Senator who was presumably trying to prevent the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. It is part factual reporting and part comment on those facts. The part which concerns the Missouri Compromise is factually accurate as it quotes the key Section of that Compromise. **Source B** is from a private conversation involving a key Senator who had led the moves to overturn the Missouri Compromise. His reporting of the detail of the Compromise is also factually accurate and thus equally reliable.*	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**How far do Sources A to D support the view that, in passing the Kansas‑Nebraska Act in 1854, the Democratic Party had become a sectional, Southern Party?** Though it does not explicitly mention the Democratic Party, **Source A** could be seen as **either supporting or challenging** the assertion. The source criticises those responsible for overturning the Missouri Compromise. Its author, Charles Sumner, a Massachusetts Senator, was a leading abolitionist and in early 1854 a member of the Free Soil party. Those he labelled 'abolitionists of freedom' could only be Democrats. The bitterness of his denunciation shows how deep divisions over the issue of slavery, between North and South, were becoming. Sumner does not make any distinction between North and South, which means Source A is a challenge. However, the reference to slavery, a solely Southern concern, could be perceived as criticism of the Democrats for narrow sectional interest. *This source is a speech to the US Senate, presumably as it considered the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, which, as Source B shows, became law three months later. The speech is bound to be partisan. If it aimed to gain enough support to stop the Bill, it might be less so. However, Sumner might well be talking more to anti-slavery supporters in the country. Whatever his focus, the source is unreliable in helping to decide whether the Democratic Party had become a sectional party.* Another source which does not mention the Democratic party by name**, Source B challenges** the hypothesis because it maintains that the choice of whether a state is slave or free will be left to the people of that would-be state. Slavery would not be imposed. It also challenges the prompt because its author is a Northern Democrat. *As a Northern Democrat and a leading figure in the passing of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, Douglas is bound to be partisan. The source itself is a private discussion between Douglas and an army officer some years later, which reduces the need to be partisan. The account of the discussion is factual, with Douglas quoted in the third person and without obvious bias, which gives it a certain reliability.* **Source C,** which does mention the Democratic Party, does also **support** the prompt**.** It says the Kansas-Nebraska Act was opposed by 'the Whigs of the free states … to a man'. It goes on to say that 'the Democratic party has lost its moral strength in the free states,' i.e. the North. ***Source C** is from a Northern newspaper which supports the Democratic party and yet refers to 'the barbarous institution of slavery'. It talks of the Democratic Party in the free states being in a minority for years to come. Though this proves to be an accurate prediction, it cannot be used to assess the reliability of Source C. The factual elements of the source can be checked by use of contextual knowledge, which proves the source's reliability. Dishonour is such a subjective, emotional concept, that it cannot be measured.*	**25**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Source D challenges** the assertion, at least with regards to Illinois. It shows the Democrats winning federal elections in a free state. It mocks the failure of abolitionists to prevent the triumph of the Democrats in Illinois. However, its mention of 'the general defection of Democratic states', presumably in the North, seems to indicate that Illinois was the exception. Those who focus on 'general defection', arguing therefore that Source D supports the assertion, should be credited for their careful reading of the text. ***Source D*** *was from an Ohio newspaper which is clearly a Democratic party supporter. It was bound to exaggerate what would appear to be a rare Democratic victory among Northern states. Thus in assessing whether the Democratic party had become a sectional party, its evidence is unreliable.*	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence about German disarmament.** **Similarities** include: • Both agree that German disarmament was a condition of Versailles. • Both agree that Germany believed that its disarmament would lead to other countries following suit. • They agree that Germany has disarmed (albeit somewhat grudgingly in **Source A**). • German disarmament is a first-step towards wider disarmament. **Differences** include: • In **Source B** Germany has disarmed and is fully compliant whereas **Source A** suggests they might have disarmed. • **Source B** thinks that German disarmament is supposed to be the first step in general disarmament. **Source A** suggests that this was never agreed and is not the case. • Germany's attitude is shown as being obstructive in **Source A** – wanting to be 'free from their power of the bargain'. In **Source B** the Germans declare themselves to be 'co-operative'. *The sources contrast since one is a German perspective and the other a British perspective. There is a difference of opinion on who has promised what. Britain is not disputing the agreement to disarm but have a difference of opinion about the extent. Britain's attitude to Germany is distrustful.*	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	**How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that the Allied Powers were willing to match German disarmament?** **Source A** suggests there is some degree of disarmament going on, but it is not a strong support. It offers more of a challenge to the assertion. Although pledged to disarm, not to the level that the Germans are stating, seems to be at odds with the stand which the League has now taken. ***Source A** is a British source and might evidence Britain trying to get out of what they promised by laying blame on Germany and the League (possible cold feet about disarmament). Could explain the context that Britain thought what had been done to Germany was too harsh anyway.* **Source B** offers some support by suggesting that, at first, statesmen in other countries were pledged to disarm and this was legally binding. It challenges the assertion by suggesting that the Allies should match Germany's level of disarmament. The fact this is being mentioned suggests the Allies have not carried out their promise to disarm. ***Source B** is a German source. Context could be used such as the Depression having bad impact on Germany. Groener was also Defence Minister, concerned about the growth of Nazism.* **Source C** supports the assertion as it suggests that Britain has carried out obligations to the letter and disarmed to Germany's level. It offers a challenge by also suggesting that other nations have not done the same as Britain, so they are clearly not prepared to disarm to Germany's level. ***Source C** is a British source and the Vice-Admiral therefore ought to be aware of changes made to British armaments and will have been part of discussions on naval limitation. The source defends Britain's part and suggests that there is a problem with the League (could go into context here – has failed to act in Manchuria which gives his comments about people not trusting the League to protect their security some credibility).* **Source D** challenges the assertion by suggesting that the Allies have not disarmed and therefore Hitler is accusing them of breaking their promise. ***Source D** is a British source. It is published after the rise to power of Hitler, and in the same month as Germany withdrew from the Disarmament Conference. Hitler used the excuse that Germany was the only power which had disarmed. Context of Hitler's anti-Versailles stance and policies to rearm could be used.*	**25**