

---

**HISTORY**

**9389/11**

Paper 1 Document Question

**October/November 2019**

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 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **11** 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.

<b>Part (a)</b>	<b>Generic Levels of Response:</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 4:</b>	<b>Makes a developed comparison</b> 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.	<b>12–15</b>
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Compares views and identifies similarities and differences</b> Compares the views expressed in the sources, identifying differences and similarities. Begins to explain and evaluate the views using the sources and knowledge.	<b>8–11</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Compares views and identifies similarities and/or differences</b> 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.	<b>4–7</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Describes content of each source</b> 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.	<b>1–3</b>
<b>Level 0:</b>	<b>No relevant comment on the sources or the issue</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>Part (b)</b>	<b>Generic Levels of Response:</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 5:</b>	<b>Evaluates the sources to reach a sustained judgement</b> 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.	<b>21–25</b>
<b>Level 4:</b>	<b>Evaluates the sources</b> 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.	<b>16–20</b>
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>Uses the sources to support and challenge the statement</b> 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.	<b>11–15</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>Uses the sources to support or challenge the statement</b> 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.	<b>6–10</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>Does not make valid use of the sources</b> 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.	<b>1–5</b>
<b>Level 0:</b>	<b>No relevant comment on the sources or the issue</b>	<b>0</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast Bismarck’s views of foreign relations in Sources A and D.</b></p> <p>Similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Prussian interests come first</b> ‘I am a Prussian’ [Source A] compared with ‘our further national development’ [Source D].</li> <li>• <b>Prepared to go to war</b> ‘I would see our troops fire’ [Source A] compared with ‘war must take place’ [Source D].</li> </ul> <p>Differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Position of France</b> ‘France only one piece ... in the chess game’ vs. France as the sole focus of Source D.</li> <li>• <b>War with France</b> ‘I do not anticipate conflict there’, i.e. Napoleonic France [Source A] vs. war with France ‘must take place’ [Source D].</li> <li>• <b>Attitude of Napoleon III towards Prussia/Germany</b> ‘Not the warlord type’ [Source A] vs. more willing to consider war [implied] [Source D].</li> </ul> <p><i>Source A is Bismarck writing before becoming Prussian PM. Source D is written after he was dismissed as German Chancellor in 1890. His memoirs are well known for their self-serving nature and thus are unreliable. Source A could be self-serving – Bismarck looking for advancement? – but is less likely to be so. We can’t be sure as we don’t know the seniority of the general.</i></p>	<b>15</b>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>'Bismarck always wanted to go to war with France.'</b> How far do Sources A to D support this view?</p> <p><b>Source A challenges</b> the view. The last sentence – 'I do not anticipate, at present, conflict there' – gives the impression that Bismarck did not always want to go to war with France. The fact that he states that he does not 'anticipate conflict there at present' suggests that he has not ruled out war with France at some time in the future. It does not convey that this had always been his wish. He sees Napoleon III as no warmonger.</p> <p><i>This source was written in 1857 when Bismarck was the Prussian envoy to the [liberal] Frankfurt parliament and Prussia was a conservative force, following Austria. Bismarck disliked both the liberals and Austrian leadership. 1857 was also a year after the Crimean war ended, which had destabilised Europe. His motives for writing his thoughts about European politics to a Prussian general cannot easily be identified. He shows a willingness to fight other powers, which presumably would appeal to a military man. His assessment of Napoleon III, however, comes as a surprise. The French emperor had just gone to war against Russia in what was the first European war for forty years, which challenges that 'Napoleon does not seem to be the warlord type' – though to be fair to Bismarck in the Crimean war Napoleon hardly acted as a warlord. Ultimately, it is hard to assess <b>Source A</b> for reliability.</i></p> <p><b>Source B</b> either <b>challenges</b> or <b>supports</b> the view that Bismarck always wanted to go to war with France. A summary of the <b>Challenge</b> interpretation is that, though France is preparing for war, Bismarck isn't. He is taking the waters in Varzin. He didn't think there was any approaching danger – of war, presumably. His focus on the Hohenzollern candidature for the Spanish throne was essentially diplomatic. Only when the Hohenzollerns withdrew their candidature and Napoleon asked for further concessions, which meant a diplomatic defeat for Prussia, did Bismarck decide to prepare for war. The <b>Support</b> interpretation is that Bismarck is 'happy to upset the French', to provoke them, to 'wind them up' in modern slang. He would do so only he was ready and willing to fight them – as was the case in 1870.</p> <p><i><b>Source B</b> is a diary entry written by a Prussian diplomat in Paris. Presumably, evidence of French moves is likely to be up-to-date and accurate. His description of Bismarck might be more second-hand, making it less reliable. Von Waldersee portrays a different Bismarck from the usual image of him as a planner and provoker of war. Because the source is a diary entry it is likely to be fairly reliable. Because it's from Paris, its portrayal of Bismarck might be less so.</i></p>	15

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>Source C</b> takes over from <b>Source B</b> in reporting the next stage of the Hohenzollern Candidature crisis. <b>Source C challenges</b> the prompt. It lays blame on the French who were not satisfied at their diplomatic victory when the Hohenzollerns changed their mind. It explicitly states that ‘war could have been avoided’ if Benedetti had not been ordered to get a promise that the King of Prussia would not take similar action in the future. However, <b>Source C also supports</b> the statement that Bismarck wanted war with France as he knew that his editing of the Ems telegram would provoke the French and turn ‘German and European opinion against France’. It was clear that Bismarck was not happy with the ‘victory of French diplomacy over Prussia in the Spanish affair’. The fact that he was prepared to doctor the telegram demonstrates that war had become his intention.</p> <p><i><b>Source C</b> is from the same author as <b>Source B</b>. The points made there also apply to <b>Source C</b>: evidence of French moves is likely to be accurate, of Prussian moves less so. In <b>Source C</b> von Waldersee portrays a Bismarck more in line with the usual image of him as a provoker of war. Because the source is a diary entry it is likely to be fairly reliable. Because it’s from Paris, its portrayal of Bismarck might be less reliable. Would von Waldersee in Paris know that Bismarck had cynically altered the Ems Telegram?</i></p> <p><b>Source D</b> also <b>challenges</b> and <b>supports</b> the assertion. <b>The challenge</b> is based on the assertion that a Franco-German war was inevitable, given French opposition to a united Germany. According to <b>Source D</b>, France wanted to ‘prevent the unification and national development of Germany’ and France would be needed by the ‘non-Prussian parts of Germany to the south ‘to fight us off’. <b>Source D supports</b> the assertion because if war is inevitable Prussian needed to prepare for it. ‘We had to keep this eventuality in mind’, which meant military and diplomatic preparations were essential. There is no evidence that Bismarck was working to avoid a war with France. He accepted Prussia had to fight to complete the ‘national development of Germany.</p> <p><i><b>Source D</b> is an extract from Bismarck’s memoirs, which was a notoriously self-serving account of his life and times. As evidence of his willingness to go to war, <b>Source D</b> cannot be trusted.</i></p>	

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast the views on the importance of the Wilmot Proviso given in Sources B and D.</b></p> <p>Differences include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source B</b> it is not the place of the federal government to decide what happens in states or territories vs. <b>Source D</b> says that the federal government should make sure slavery does not spread.</li> <li>• <b>Source B</b> is against the Wilmot Proviso because it undermines local authorities vs. <b>Source D</b> is in favour because slavery has become a national issue, to be decided by the whole country. The provenance of <b>Source D</b> gives a big clue about its attitude.</li> </ul> <p>Similarities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources see the Wilmot Proviso as threatening slaveholding states. For <b>Source B</b> the evidence has to be pieced together: The Proviso has been a national issue as it would give Congress power to interfere in states over the issue of slavery. <b>Source D</b> sees the Proviso as preserving freedom and an assault on slavery.</li> <li>• The Proviso has provoked a national debate. <b>Source B</b> says it ‘has been repeatedly discussed in Congress and in the public press’ while <b>Source D</b> talks about the ‘powerful and exciting debates which echoed through the halls of the Capitol’.</li> <li>• Both acknowledge the importance of the Proviso to the government and politics of the USA.</li> </ul> <p><i>Both B and D are Northern sources. Source B comes from Lewis Cass, a Democrat, who argues against the Wilmot Proviso on constitutional grounds: slavery was a local, not a national issue. This idea would become known as popular sovereignty. Writing in December 1847, Cass probably had one eye on the forthcoming Presidential election, less than a year away. Source D comes from an electioneering pamphlet from the radical Free Soil party published in election year. The party had broken away from the Democrats after they had chosen Cass and not van Buren as their candidate. Cass’s popular sovereignty would be more acceptable to the South than van Buren’s Free Soil movement. Neither will be very reliable when it comes to the Wilmot Proviso.</i></p>	15

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>‘The main issue raised by the Mexican-American War was the power of the federal government.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view?</b></p> <p><b>Source A challenges</b> the argument that federal government power is the main issue as it focuses more on the slavery question. <b>It supports</b> the argument by suggesting that state governments should have more power, i.e. that the federal government could have too much power.</p> <p><i>Source A is from a Southern newspaper published in the middle of the war with Mexico. The war was going well, which probably raised Southern hopes of gaining more lands where slavery could be introduced. The Wilmot Proviso threatened that expansion. Hence the emotional language of the report, which makes it unreliable when considering either approach to the (b) question.</i></p> <p><b>Source B supports</b> the idea of federal government being the main issue as it focuses on ‘how our government works’. It also argues that state governments should have more have more power.</p> <p><i>Source B is from a Northern politician writing a private letter to someone in a slave state towards the end of the Mexican war. As the politician was intending to run for the Presidency, he would outline policies acceptable to the South. While his sending a private letter makes this more reliable than a public letter, the arguments put forward cannot be wholly reliable when it comes to the issue of slavery and/or the power of federal government.</i></p> <p><b>Source C challenges</b> the prompt as it focuses very much on slavery. It supports the prompt by arguing that federal governments should have – and have had via the Ordinance of 1787 – more power.</p> <p><i>Source C is, like Source B, from a Northern Democratic Source. Unlike Source B, it takes a more critical view of slavery and of state power. It criticises the view of state power developed by Cass in Source B, thus illustrating the division among Northern Democrats. As a public statement by a group of elected representatives in election year, it is not going to be noted for its reliability as an account of the two issues of slavery and federal government power.</i></p> <p><b>Source D also challenges</b> the prompt as it concentrates on the slavery question suggesting that when it comes to the issue of slavery, national voters should have more power.</p> <p><i>Source D is clearly a party view aimed at voters and thus very partisan. Its arguments are bound to present a particular view of slavery and federalism and thus need to be dismissed as reliable evidence for either. The source is useful, however, in illustrating the growing radicalism of critics of slavery. Note, though, that the Free Soil pamphlet did not advocate abolitionism.</i></p>	25

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and C regarding the League of Nations' response to Japanese aggression in Manchuria.</b></p> <p><b>Differences include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source B</b> says the League 'did not pronounce Japan guilty of resorting to war in disregard of the Covenant Article 16 and therefore could not take action' vs. <b>Source C</b> attributes the lack of action to its most powerful members lacking [economic] interests in Manchuria. Thus legal reasons vs. economic/political.</li> </ul> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources agree that the League took no effective action. <b>Source B</b> does so by asking why Britain, the leading power of the League, did not take action in Manchuria similar to its actions in Abyssinia. <b>Source C</b> mentions that the League 'was not particularly active in response to Japan's aggression in Manchuria.</li> </ul> <p><i><b>Source B</b> is from a public speech by a British party politician in 1935, as the Abyssinian crisis reached its height. This political context means that Stanhope is going to put the most favourable gloss on the actions of the League. <b>Source C</b> is from a public speech during the Abyssinian crisis, this time by an Australian politician. This source will therefore have a different perspective. It is critical of British policy, which might be a surprise given that Australia had close links to the UK. Thus it is a bit more reliable than <b>Source B</b>.</i></p>	15

Question	Indicative Content	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>‘Britain’s actions during the Abyssinian crisis demonstrated its commitment to the principles of the League of Nations.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view?</b></p> <p><b>Source A supports</b> the statement by speaking of Britain’s adherence to ‘collective security and ‘legality in international affairs’. It is highly supportive of the stance that Britain has taken.</p> <p><i>The letter was written by Jan Smuts, the South African diplomat; he was writing to the British League of Nations Union and as South Africa was an ally of Britain and a keen advocate of the League of Nations, he was unlikely to be critical of Britain’s actions. Thus it is not the most reliable analysis of British commitment.</i></p> <p><b>Source B supports</b> the statement. Lord Stanhope maintains that Britain urged action because of ‘Italy’s disregard for the Covenant’. Britain, as a leading member of the League, had to support Abyssinia. He might also be seen as playing down the role of the UK as a leader of the League when he talks of ‘other countries’ having ‘played their full part’. However, this merely complements Britain’s role and does not undermine British commitment.</p> <p><i>This is a public speech by an unelected politician at a time of national and international crisis. Stanhope will be defensive and partisan in his exposition of British policy, making the source unreliable.</i></p> <p><b>Source C challenges</b> the statement in that it suggests that Britain may not have been supporting the principles of the League. The Australian politician questions Britain’s commitment to the principles of the League and the maintenance of peace by arguing that Britain was acting out of self-interest.</p> <p><i>Another public speech by a politician, this one critical of the British position over Abyssinia. Given the close links between Britain and Australia, this criticism comes as a surprise. However, these links might have given Australia a better understanding of actual British motives. Also, Australia was a Pacific Rim power and British policy towards Japanese aggression in Manchuria might have caused Australia much concern.</i></p> <p><b>Source D challenges</b> the assertion. The main message of <b>Source D</b> is that Britain has abandoned the principle of the League and given in to threats of Italian aggression. Initially, Britain had led the way and shown its commitment to the League, as is shown by the first few lines of the source. However, it had later abandoned those principles almost completely and thereby losing its claim to offer guidance to other countries.</p> <p><i>Churchill is here criticising the government of which he is not a member. Thus he can attack rather than defend. He is in a different position from Stanhope in <b>Source B</b>. His arguments are a fairly accurate account of events, as shown by the allusion to the Hoare-Laval Pact. Thus the source is quite reliable.</i></p>	25