
HISTORY

9389/13

Paper 1

May/June 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 May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **14** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**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.

PUBLISHED

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

PUBLISHED

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

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	<p>Compare and contrast the attitudes towards the Piedmontese monarchy in Sources B and D.</p> <p>Differences: Source B is largely critical of the King. It refers to him as being lazy and ill-informed. He disliked taking decisions and actually doing business such as Cabinet meetings. Source B refers to him as being ‘mediocre’, whereas Source D speaks more positively about the King, but interestingly refers more to the monarchy than the King himself.</p> <p>Source B describes the King as recognising the superiority of the Prime Minister whereas in Source D, Cavour only has the ‘erratic support of the King’.</p> <p>Similarities: Source B suggests the monarchy needs safeguarding by others, so the King does not damage it by his hunting and womanising at critical moments. Source D also suggests that ‘Cavour was the genius of the period’.</p> <p>Source B suggests that ‘he is not a sovereign of no merit’ and Source D refers to his intelligence.</p> <p>Both suggest he is not a reliable ruler – Source B says he is lazy and ill-informed and Source D talks about his erratic support of Cavour.</p> <p>Source B is written by a French diplomat working in Turin at the time. It is reasonably well-balanced and he might be in a position to know what is going on. Source D is written after the major events of the unification process when the passions have settled and has the advantage of hindsight. It seems to adopt a more balanced perspective.</p>	15	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	<p>'Cavour played the decisive role in the struggle for Italian unity.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?</p> <p>Source A challenges the statement and is highly critical of Cavour who is seen as a real obstacle to Italian unity and independence. The Source suggests Cavour is more concerned with defeating his opponents and used illegal methods to attain his ends. His skills seem to be mainly intrigue and plotting. The suggestion that he waged 'a ruthless war against revolution' is very strong criticism.</p> <p><i>Source A is clearly written by a very strong opponent of Cavour, frightened enough to cancel his loathing until he had heard that Cavour was dead. The fact that he came from Sardinia which he may have felt had been neglected by the 'mainland' needs to be taken into account. It sounds like the comment of a frustrated rival. It does seem like an angry rant and should be treated with caution.</i></p> <p>Source B supports the statement. It recognises that he is 'superior' to the King. He stresses how important Cavour was in preventing the King from marrying his mistress secretly, which would damage not only the monarchy, but also the cause of Italian unity. The source does stress that Cavour is important to the cause and its success, but perhaps not decisively so.</p> <p><i>Source B obviously has some merit, being written by a diplomat present in Turin at a critical moment in the unification process.</i></p> <p>Source C supports the statement and praises Cavour very highly. He also mentions Cavour's important work in preserving the monarchy's authority and avoiding too radical an approach which would have alienated the British and led to attacks from Austrian and France. Of the three sources this is the one that best supports the argument that his role was decisive.</p> <p><i>Source C was written by an Italian historian quite soon after the death of Cavour, when perhaps eulogies were more the order of the day than attacks. The opening sentence does give the impression that he is arguing a case against the critics of Cavour, so this needs to be borne in mind.</i></p>	25	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	<p>Source D supports the statement by emphasising Cavour's importance, perhaps he is a member of the 'small minority' mentioned in the opening sentence. The source also mentions that Cavour was the 'genius' of the period, and that with the erratic support of the King, made unity possible. With the final sentence referring to the 'amazing miracle of politics' achieved by Cavour, this source could also be used to support the 'decisive' argument. There is also an element of challenge as other factors such as 'foreign events and coincidences' as well as the Piedmontese monarchy are also given some credit.</p> <p>Source D is written a generation after Cavour's death, when a more balanced view could be taken. Contextual knowledge might suggest that this is a balanced and intelligent view.</p> <p>On balance, the sources suggest that Cavour's role as crucial to Italian unity was decisive. Sources B, C and D all give him credit and even when the effusive nature of C is taken into account this evidence remains strong thanks to the more balanced views of B and D. A is perhaps the least useful source although it is a useful mirror to Source C to reflect the extreme and partial views held about Cavour.</p>		

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	<p>To what extent do Sources C and D agree about the issue that was causing conflict in Kansas?</p> <p>Differences: Source D sees land ownership as the main issue, while Source C has no doubt that it is slavery. Source D states that although Southerners were urged to move slaves into Kansas, very few were taken. Source C, on the other hand, makes it clear that slavery was the main issue. It says that the Missouri secret societies were trying to extend slavery into Kansas and elsewhere.</p> <p>Source C suggests that it is a wider project to develop a ‘union of all the friends of slavery’, whereas Source D concentrates on Kansas.</p> <p>Source C suggests that actions in Kansas were organised by secret societies, whereas Source D concentrates on the actions of individuals.</p> <p>Similarities: Source B does agree with Source C in that it recognises slavery as an issue. It says that some Southerners urged people in Missouri to take their slaves with them into Kansas and this fits in with the claim in B that their aim was to extend slavery into Kansas.</p> <p>Both link the issue of slavery in Kansas with events and expansion from Missouri.</p>	15	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(b)	<p>How far do Sources A to D support the view that it was politicians in Washington DC who were responsible for the trouble in Kansas following the Kansas–Nebraska Act?</p> <p>Evidence supporting the assertion includes Sources A and B.</p> <p>Source A claims that Congress is responsible by passing the Act and thus damaging liberty and allowing slavery to spread. It asserts that the Act got through by lies and treachery and that Congress is responsible for kidnappings. It suggests that the future will not be good because liberty had been weakened and it predicts that Freemen will act. Thus, it is implying that there will be trouble.</p> <p><i>Source A is from a New York Whig newspaper and Northern Whigs were strongly opposed to the Democrats and the Act. This means the accusations made in Source A have to be treated with care. Some of its language, e.g. ‘Slavery crawls, like a slimy reptile’ shows the strength of its feelings.</i></p> <p>Source B blames leading Democratic politicians such as Douglas who proposed the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, agreed to repeal the Missouri Compromise and forced the legislation through. Other Democrats are blamed such as President Pierce. They are shown as forcing slavery on the free-soilers in Kansas by passing the Act and thus causing the trouble in Kansas. This will encourage Southerners to extend slavery into Kansas and upset abolitionists.</p> <p><i>Source B is from a Northern publication and so is likely to be against the Democrats, the Act and its consequences, especially in terms of the threat of slavery in Kansas. (Harper’s Weekly was pro-abolition).</i></p> <p>Evidence challenging the assertion includes Sources C and D.</p> <p>Source C blames Southerners who organised secret societies with the aim of encouraging pro-slavery men to emigrate into Kansas with the aim of extending slavery into the territory. They also sent men from Missouri to vote in elections to get pro-slavery candidates elected and were responsible for armed invasions of the territory.</p>	25	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(b)	<p><i>Source C strongly criticises pro-slavers from Missouri. It is a report from a Congressional committee and so is unlikely to blame politicians in Washington. The committee was chaired by a Republican who would be anti-slavery. This means the report of the committee might only blame those from the South. While there is evidence that supports the claims made against these societies, the report is one-sided in that it makes no mention of the violence committed by abolitionists such as John Brown.</i></p> <p>Source D claims that Southerners from Missouri came across the border and illegally staked claims for land which they defended with violence. This caused trouble with settlers from the North who arrived looking for land and found the Southerners had already claimed it.</p> <p><i>Source D is written by an abolitionist which means that the claims he makes about Southerners taking over all the land need to be considered carefully. He was living in Kansas in 1857 so he saw events with his own eyes. However, the fact that he arrived in 1857 suggests that he might be one of settlers from the North arriving to fight the anti-slavery battle.</i></p> <p>On balance, the sources are clearly split according to where they originate from. Sources A and B give a national perspective on the issue prioritising the actions of leading politicians, whereas the more local sources (C and D) see this as an issue originating from Missouri and Kansas.</p>		

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	<p>To what extent do Sources B and C agree about the Lytton Report?</p> <p>Differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source B says the report is admirable and valuable, cannot be criticised and could form the basis of a settlement. Source C, on the other hand, does find some criticism of the report justifiable – that it takes too favourable a view of the future of China. • Source B suggests it exonerates Japan and that there are hopes for a settlement that Japan will be happy with. Source C describes Japan's unhappiness with the report, suggesting that Japan at least does not feel it has been exonerated. This is backed up by the fact that the Report has rejected Japanese claims about Manchukuo. <p>Similarities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Sources imply that there is some blame of Japan in the Report. Source B says 'Japan must expect some blame', while Source C implies the Report blames Japan by mentioning the dissatisfaction in Japan over the Report and the fact that the Report has denied Japanese claims about Manchukuo. • Both sources suggest that Japan would not be in favour of any Chinese sovereignty. <p>Source B is written by an official in the British foreign office and is very supportive of the Lytton Report, stating that 'there is nothing of any substance which I feel able to criticise'. However, Source C, written in the same month by the British Ambassador in Japan, writes of how the Japanese press are dissatisfied with the report and that he believes that justifiable criticism of the report is that 'too favourable view is taken of the present conditions and future prospects of China'. The official of the British foreign office is likely to be supportive of the government and not keen to offer any criticism, whereas the Japanese Ambassador was able to see first hand the reactions of the Japanese to the report and is portraying the reaction of the Japanese people rather than his own view.</p>	15	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(b)	<p>How far do Sources A to D support the view that Japan was concerned about the League?</p> <p>Evidence supporting the assertion includes Sources B.</p> <p>Source B suggests that Japan is concerned about the League. It states that Japan might well accept some of the criticisms made by the League and that it does not want to leave the League.</p> <p><i>Source B is from an official in the British foreign office and therefore will take an optimistic view of Japan and its possible reactions. Britain did not want to push Japan too far because it did not want to weaken its civilian government and strengthen the hand of the military in Japan. The British also knew that the League could do little without US action, which was not forthcoming.</i></p> <p>Source C suggests that Japan was concerned enough about the League to be upset by the Commission's findings. It also explains that the civilian government in Japan was concerned about the League. It did not want a conflict with the League because it was worried about the possible consequences. They also felt that leaving the League would damage Japan's international standing.</p> <p><i>Source C is written by the British Ambassador in Japan. This is useful in the sense that he should have a good understanding of the situation inside Japan and the attitudes of different groups in the country, particularly the military and the civilian government. However, as someone who works in Japan, he does show some sympathy towards Japan and he is keen to press the idea that Japan is not keen to leave the League.</i></p>	25	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(b)	<p>Evidence for challenging the assertion includes Sources A and D.</p> <p>Source A makes clear that Japan was not concerned about the League. It mentions that even when the Council was meeting, the Japanese advanced further, and that there was no prospect of Japan withdrawing its troops. It is keen stress that Japan was ignoring the League and that the League was powerless.</p> <p><i>Source A is a report from an official Soviet newspaper. The USSR had been refused membership of the League (it joined in 1934) and was critical of it for this reason and because it saw it as a capitalistic club. This means that some of the criticism of the League in this source has to be treated with care. The Soviets were extremely concerned about a strong Japanese presence in northern China and may be reflecting on their history of conflict with Japan.</i></p> <p>Source D totally rejects the report and the League to such an extent that it states it is leaving the League. This displays contempt for the League. It cares so little about the League that it is ready to leave and is prepared to be highly critical of the League.</p> <p><i>Source D is from a Japanese telegram from the Japanese to the League announcing its withdrawal. The very fact that it is withdrawing shows this source to be useful evidence about Japan's lack of interest in the League. However, the telegram is making the case for leaving and therefore some of the criticisms made of the League need to be considered with caution.</i></p> <p>On balance, the sources suggest that Japan's primary concern was to maintain their position in Manchuria (Source A, B, C and D). If this could have been achieved whilst also retaining membership of the League (B and C particularly) this would have been the ideal scenario. However, given a choice the former aim was always going to be the priority and trump any concerns they had about the League (Sources A and D).</p>		