

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2014 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/12

Paper 1 (Document Question 12), 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 2014 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	System Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2014	938

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 source 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	System Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2014	938

Section A: European Option

Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1848–1871

The Problems of Italian Nationalists

- 1 (a) **Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence about the attitudes of foreigners towards Italy.** [15]

Though 'Italy' did not exist in 1848–49, except as a mere geographical expression, the use of the word in the question is taken to mean events in Italy at the time.

Both sources are written by foreigners and by foreigners from two western European countries who were living in Italy at the time of the 1848–49 revolutions. Both sources are written by ambassadors who were expected to report with some objectivity on the countries in which they served. At the same time, they were reporting to their political masters in their native countries and thus could be expected to reflect the culture of those countries. Source A was written by the ambassador from Belgium, a newly independent country formed by revolution in the 1830s, which was strongly Roman Catholic. He was reporting from Rome, the home of the Pope. Source B was written by the ambassador from the UK, a Protestant country and a great power. He was reporting from Piedmont, at that time a minor European state with ambitions to become a leading state in Italy, fighting Austria in 1848–49 to try and do so. Those attempts resulted in defeat in July 1848 at Custoza and in March 1849 at Novara. After Novara, the king of Piedmont abdicated in favour of his son, Victor Emmanuel.

Both sources are in favour of change in Italy, which is to be expected given the two countries they represent. Source A fears that obstacles will be put in the way of independence; Source B talks of Britain acting firmly to stop oppression of Italian freedoms. Both focus on obstacles to reform, whether for national independence (Source A) or the freedom of one Italian state (Source B). Context tells us that this state was trying to put itself at the head of the movement for national freedom, which means that the two sources are concerned with obstacles to national unity. Source A sees those obstacles as coming from the Italians themselves. States and towns are antagonistic towards each other. Patriotism is hard to find. Political parties put their own interests before those of Italy. Source B, however, identifies a different obstacle, namely the intervention of an external power, Austria, to crush a monarch who had promised to maintain constitutional government. Whereas Source A has no interest in great power politics – in fact it begins by saying that the main obstacle to freedom does *not* come from outside Italy – Source B has no interest in Italian domestic politics. Both take a pessimistic, even patronising view of Italy, seeing Italians as too weak or too divided to achieve the national revolutions which both Britain and Belgium had achieved.

- (b) **How far do Sources A to D agree that Austria was the greatest problem faced by the Italian nationalists?** [25]

Context: Austria was a problem of greater or lesser importance for Italian nationalists from 1815 to 1866. After 1815 and the Congress of Vienna, Austria was the great power which dominated the politics of Italy, even if France tried to limit that power, as in 1830–32. Not only did Austria control two of the wealthiest states of the peninsula, Lombardy and Venetia, but it exercised indirect control over most, if not all, of the remaining states. A conservative power ruling over many nations, Austria was threatened by any widespread expression of liberal or nationalist ideas, whether in print or on the streets. When, in 1848, revolutions spread from south to north in Italy, Austria was inevitably affected as well; its longstanding political leader, Metternich, was forced to stand down. Subsequently there were revolutions in Lombardy and Venetia. In Milan, the people forced the retreat of the Austrian army under Radetzky. Austria,

Page 4	Mark Scheme	System Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2014	938

though weakened, remained a problem for the nationalists, however. The so-called independence of 1848–49 against Austria, led by Piedmont under the cautious leadership of Charles Albert, resulted in an Austrian victory at Custoza. Many Italians refused to join the war effort because they thought that Charles Albert wanted to expand Piedmont rather than unite Italy. In 1849, at Novara, Austrian forces defeated a second attempt by Piedmont to defeat Austria, which then went on to reassert Habsburg authority in Lombardy and Venetia. The revolutionary Roman Republic was crushed by French forces working on behalf of the Papacy. In the 1850s, Austria remained an obstacle to Italian unity. Only the military intervention of France on the side of Piedmont in 1858–59 forced the Habsburgs to give up Lombardy. Only the war with Prussia in 1866 forced the Habsburgs to give up Venetia to the new Italian state.

Analysis: Source A briefly mentions Austria at the end of the extract. Even then, the reference is used to reinforce the Belgian ambassador’s main point, namely the disunity of Italian nationalists, rather than emphasise the obstacle that Austria provided. Disunity explains the defeat of Piedmont in 1848 according to Source A, a defeat which allowed Austria a few months later to make the demands on Piedmont contained in Source B. This second source supports the assertion that Austria was the greatest problem faced by Italian nationalists, if the state of Piedmont could be seen as nationalistic, which is doubtful.

Source C illustrates the most famous of divisions between nationalists, that between Cavour and Garibaldi in 1860. Of the two, Garibaldi was more clearly the nationalist, Cavour being firstly a Piedmontese politician and secondly an Italian nationalist. The text refers to Garibaldi’s invasion of Sicily, events with which candidates should be familiar. Source D is a speech made by the king of the new Italy, who also was the former King of Piedmont mentioned in Source B after unification had been completed. He does not mention Austria at all. The speech is optimistic. The only problem mentioned is financial, though political divisions are alluded to. Thus, analysis of the sources reveals one source, B, supporting the assertion, the other three against – on the surface, at least. The four sources need evaluating as well.

Evaluation: Candidates can use contextual knowledge to put Source D to one side. Since 1866 Austria had been no problem to the new Italy. In that year, having lost the war with Prussia, Austria had to hand over Venetia to Italy. In 1870, Italy gained control of the Papal States, including Rome. This was a time of triumph for Italians. Victor Emmanuel II, in his first public speech, would be unlikely to mention any problems at all. Source D is both unreliable and of little specific use in answering the question. Only one of the other sources focuses on Austria. Source B does not explicitly refer to Italian nationalists. Contextual knowledge should be used to show how Charles Albert, Victor Emmanuel’s father and the King of Piedmont until Austria’s victory at Novara, had set himself up as a (rather cautious) leader of Italian nationalists. Most nationalists, however, were suspicious of his motive and his commitment to the cause.

In addition, the British ambassador hopes for Anglo-French action against Austria. He does not specify whether the action was to be diplomatic or military, but in the highly-charged atmosphere of 1849 such a hope hardly suggests the impartiality to be expected of a diplomat. Source A mentions Austria only in its final sentence. It is focused on the great disunity of Italian nationalists, albeit without identifying any groups or individuals. Contextual knowledge could be used to help prove the reliability of Source A, as nationalists looked to the Pope, to Mazzini and Garibaldi and even to Piedmont in 1848–49.

Finally, Source C, written some 11–12 years after the 1848 revolutions, shows the continued disunity among nationalists, a point easily supported by further contextual knowledge. Thus source evaluation shows the sources which challenge the assertion to be the more reliable.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	System Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2014	938

Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

The Death of John Brown, 1859

- 2 (a) **Compare and contrast Sources C and D as evidence about Southern attitudes towards the death of John Brown.** [15]

Both Source C and Source D, from Southern newspapers, have their sights firmly focused on the response of people in the North to the execution of John Brown. Source C, from North Carolina, is most anxious about the effect the hanging of John Brown will have in the North. The Raleigh Register hopes that ‘the excitement of the North will subside’ but is far from hopeful that it will. In fact, it believes that there is only the ‘faintest’ hope that it will. The newspaper asserts that ‘Northern fanaticism is rampant and overrides everything’. It quotes the example of Boston, a city which has benefited from the slave-based economy of the South, now mourning the death of John Brown. Source D, from Kentucky, is more measured in its response to John Brown’s death. It argues that the extreme passions which were to be heard in the North ‘at first’, following the ‘mad act of John Brown’, have subsided. ‘A genuine Northern patriotism’ is starting to replace sectional ‘ravings’. Source D makes no direct reference to the execution of John Brown. However, it was written just over two weeks after that death, during which time passions should have cooled slightly.

- (b) **How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that the impact of the death of John Brown was short-lived?** [25]

Context: John Brown was hanged by the state of Virginia on 2nd December 1859, following a one-week trial which finished exactly a month before. The trial occurred just a week after the short-lived raid on Harpers Ferry. A jury found him guilty on three charges: conspiracy to cause a slave insurrection; murder; treason against the state of Virginia. The dignity which he showed in the last month of his life did much to win support for John Brown and the abolitionist cause. His final speech to the court and the many letters he wrote in his final month impressed many who, while sympathetic to the abolitionist cause, were critical of the raid itself. He died a hero and a martyr. He was buried in New York State six days later. In the early months of the civil war, Northern troops made John Brown the subject of the most famous civil war song of them all, *John Brown’s Body*.

Analysis: Source A clearly dismisses the assertion, arguing that ‘the shock caused by his death will be more than a nine-day wonder’. The Chicago Press and Tribune believes that the death of John Brown will affect those who ‘have been callous until now’, i.e. indifferent to the abolitionists’ cause. In so doing, the differences between North and South will become so great as to cause ‘a final conflict’, it is argued. Source B sees the death of John Brown as a defeat for slavery. Though the source does not consider how long the impact of John Brown’s death will be, talk of ‘millions of curses’ against slavery suggests that it will not be short-lived. Source C is extremely worried that John Brown’s death will be long-lasting as ‘fanaticism in the North is rampant and overrides everything’. Sources B and C together show how high passions are running in the North as a result of John Brown’s death. This gives attitudes towards slavery more of an emotional basis which will be hard to shift. Source D is more sanguine. It believes that passions will subside, that Unionist forces in the North will offset the power of abolitionist groups arguing for conflict with slave power. Thus Source D supports the assertion. It is the only one of the four sources to do so in such clear terms.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2014	938

Evaluation: Two of the sources – A and B – are from the North, the other two from the South. It is hard to deduce, however, from their origins where they would be likely to stand on the issue of the impact of the death of John Brown. In fact, both B (Northern) and C (Southern) think the impact will be long-lasting. More important, perhaps, is the date of the sources. Three are written at the time of Brown’s execution, the fourth a fortnight later. All are too close to the death to help decide whether the impact was long-lasting. Contextual knowledge becomes essential. Which side of the argument does that knowledge support? Perhaps the most useful piece of knowledge is the composition of the song *John Brown’s Body* in the first few months of the civil war by a battalion of Northern soldiers. The fact that ordinary soldiers wanted to commemorate John Brown in a war song is strong evidence that the impact of his death was long-lasting. That this song became so popular is further evidence to challenge the assertion. The song can be used to support the arguments of Source A, which in 1859 maintained that the final conflict was coming. Relevant contextual knowledge from the 1860s can also be used to challenge the assertion. One example would be the response of the French novelist, Victor Hugo, who in 1861 drew a picture of John Brown hanging from the gallows. Only one source – D – argues for the assertion. The other three oppose it as does all contextual evidence.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2014	938

Section C: International Option

The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

The League of Nations and Collective Security

- 3 (a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and D about the work of the League in the 1920s. [15]

Article 16 reflects the very strong measures which the League of Nations proposed to take against any member country which went to war in defiance of its commitments to the Covenant of the League of Nations. Paul-Boncour (Source D) argues that these measures were effectively implemented throughout the 1920s and that, as a result, the League successfully settled a number of disputes, any of which could have led to a serious international crisis. He claims that the League was successful in settling these disputes because governments, ‘and particularly the governments of the Great Powers’, supported the League and were willing to enforce its decisions with their own military power (as required under Article 16). He argues that it was only later that member governments failed to support the League against aggressive and imperialistic states, a reference to Japan, Italy and Germany.

The cartoonist (Source B) suggests that there were fundamental weaknesses in the League’s implementation of Article 16 even in the 1920s, implying that these weaknesses might at some point be exploited. The image of ‘War’ is depicted as held down by wholly inadequate string. War might be sleeping now, but, once awake, would have no difficulty in removing the restraints. The cartoon is, therefore, accurately predicting the League’s inability to confront aggressive states, such as Japan, Italy and Germany, during the 1930s. The cartoon is not critical of the League, which would clearly prefer War to be restrained with chains. It is critical of ‘World Statesmanship’ – politicians such as Cecil and Lloyd George, who are depicted as smugly hiding behind the League of Nations. The implication is that fear of war is making nations weak, something which, in time, could be exploited by aggressive states. The cartoonist is, therefore, suggesting that the League’s successes during the 1920s (as mentioned in Source D) came despite fundamental weaknesses in its implementation of Article 16 due to lack of support from member states.

Although Source D has the advantage of hindsight which Source B does not have, Source B is a more accurate reflection of reality. Paul-Boncour (Source D) was speaking at the meeting in 1946 which formally ended the League of Nations, an emotional affair at which he was clearly wishing to highlight the League’s successes. The examples he cites were relatively minor affairs in which none of the Great Powers had any direct interest. The countries involved were prepared to accept the League’s decisions because of the threat of combined action under Article 16 rather than the reality of it. Once confronted with disputes which did involve the interests of a Great Power, as happened during the 1930s (e.g. Japanese invasion of Manchuria, Italian invasion of Abyssinia), the League was unable to take effective action – just as the cartoonist (Source B) predicted.

- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that collective security did not work? [25]

Context: The horrors of WWI led statesmen, encouraged by anti-war public opinion, to seek ways to ensure that such a war could never happen again. As a result, the League of Nations was established as part of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, with the aim of providing a forum for international disputes to be settled by diplomacy, conciliation and compromise rather than by war. Appreciating that the League required a method of enforcing its decisions, its Covenant included Article 16, which established the principle of collective security. Member

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2014	938

countries would work together to confront any nation which went to war or behaved aggressively in defiance of the League. This would involve:

- Economic sanctions, to include ‘the severance of all trade’
- Joint military action
- Mutual support among member states taking economic or military action against a state which was acting in defiance of the Covenant of the League.

These were strong measures, and Article 16 establishes that they will be imposed against any transgressor state. However, their successful implementation depended on the support of the member states without which the League, with no armed forces of its own, was powerless. No country would have been willing to sign the Covenant if doing so would give the League the right to control its armed forces – hence the League’s Council could only ‘recommend’ what military or economic actions member states should take. This could be a fundamental weakness if, for example, the national interests of a member state conflicted with the decision of the League.

The League was largely successful in dealing with disputes during the 1920s, but this was largely because the disputes were relatively minor affairs in which the Great Powers had no direct interest. The League’s weaknesses were, therefore, largely camouflaged during the 1920s and only became fully exposed when the League’s authority was challenged by powerful nations, such as Japan, Italy and Germany, during the 1930s. In the 1920s, the threat of collective security action was enough to bring disputes to an end – the commitment of member nations to collective security was never really tested until the 1930s, when it was found wanting, as in the League’s failure to confront Japanese aggression in Manchuria and Italian aggression against Abyssinia.

Analysis: In support of the hypothesis, Sources B and C both suggest that a fundamental weakness of collective security was its total reliance on the members of the League, especially the Great Powers, supporting its decision to impose sanctions against aggressor states. Although this was somewhat camouflaged during the 1920s, the cartoon (Source B) predicts that this weakness will become a major problem in the future – ‘World Statesmanship’, i.e. diplomats of the Great Powers are perceived as too frightened to take effective action in order to prevent future war. The politicians are depicted as considerably smaller than the threat of war, which is held in check not by the strength of the League, but due to the fact that it is sleeping. Source C suggests that the cartoon’s prediction came true ‘because of the reluctance of nearly all the nations in Europe to proceed to...military sanctions’. Collective security, Baldwin argues, could only work if all member states were constantly ready for war and willing to go to war against an aggressor state even if their own national interests were not directly at stake. Source D confirms that, when confronted with the actions of aggressor states in the 1930s, collective security failed because member states refused to honour their commitment to the Covenant and opted for appeasement instead. Article 16 itself (Source A) makes it clear that the League would not be able to compel member states to take economic or military action, merely to recommend what actions they should take.

In challenging the hypothesis, Sources B, C and D all contain evidence which suggests that collective security could have been successful if only member states of the League supported it fully. Source B shows the League confused by the weak measures taken by ‘World Statesmanship’ in its efforts to prevent future wars; stronger measures (chains not string) would have been more effective. Source C suggests that member states were putting their own national interests before their commitments to the League; with greater commitment from member states, collective security could have been effective. Source D argues that collective security was, indeed, effective during the 1920s since it gave the League the power/authority to settle a number of disputes.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	System Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2014	938

On balance the sources support the hypothesis, since the national interests of member states and their fear of becoming involved in another major war led to their unwillingness to support the League in taking strong measures against aggressor states.

Evaluation: Source A, coming from Article 16 itself, shows how the League was intending to enforce its decisions. In joining the League by signing the Covenant, member states were agreeing to this Article and, therefore, accepting their responsibility to support the League by taking economic and military action if and when required. The League could only recommend what action member states should take, and was therefore reliant on the willingness of those states to keep to their commitment. The Covenant was established at a time when anti-war sentiment ran high and when the combined power of member states would have been sufficient to keep potentially aggressive states in check.

Source B, the cartoon, is based on the opinions of the artist and the newspaper in which it was published, but is also likely to reflect (and even to have helped shape) public opinion in Britain. It was published in 1927, at a time when the League was being largely effective in settling potential disputes (as shown in D). However, these disputes were relatively minor affairs which did not affect the national interests of any of the Great Powers. It was the threat of collective security rather than the reality of it which gave the League authority. The cartoon predicts that, when War awakens, it will be too strong for the League to cope with – as happened with the League’s weak response to the aggressive actions of Japan, Italy and Germany during the 1930s.

Source C is a speech made in June 1936, by which time it was clear that the League had failed to take effective action against the Italian invasion of Abyssinia (just as it had against Japan’s aggression against Manchuria). Baldwin argues that collective security could only work if all members of the League were on a constant war-footing, ready to take military action swiftly against aggressor states. Baldwin argues that ‘nearly all the nations in Europe’ were unwilling or unable to make such a commitment.

Source D is a speech made in hindsight during the emotional meeting which formally ended the League of Nations. It argues that collective security was successful during the 1920s, but that it failed in the 1930s when aggression was greeted with appeasement rather than strong measures. Paul-Boncour argues that this aggression could have been dealt with effectively if the League’s Covenant had been rigorously applied (as with Source B).