



## Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

HISTORY

9389/11

Paper 1 Document Question 11

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.

---

This document consists of **12** 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.

Part(a)	Generic Levels of Response:	Marks
<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	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and C about Austria's attitude towards Italy.</b></p> <p><b>Similarities</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources express the view that Austria wants control. <b>Source A</b> maintains that 'Austria is determined to rule or influence much of Italy' and <b>Source C</b> states that the Governor of Lombardy believes that Austria can continue to control Italy if 'at least two more armies' are sent.</li> <li>• Both sources believe that Austria's attitude of wanting to control Italy will cause problems for Austria. <b>Source A</b> states that it 'will ruin Austria's finances and lead to further war'. <b>Source C</b> recognises the risk of revolution by referring to the Italians loathing the Austrian system of government which 'will enable the plague of revolution to spread from Piedmont into Lombardy and Venetia and then into the Papal States'.</li> <li>• Both sources agree that Austria is imposing its rule on Italy. <b>Source C's</b> view is that despite their monarch being 'paternal, just and generous', the Italians 'want their own system of government and not one imposed on them by Austrians'. He believes that the current structure of government will enable revolution to spread. <b>Source A</b> agrees by saying that 'Austria seems determined to rule or influence much of Italy'.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source A</b> stresses that Austria's 'only motive is self-interest' and that it wants to prevent ideas of nationalism and liberty moving into the territories. However, <b>Source C</b> praises the Austrian government stating that it has brought the Italians many advantages such as 'equality before the law and no arbitrary government behaviour'.</li> </ul> <p><i>Source A is writing in 1815 to the British Prince Regent. The Count is clearly opposed to Austria having territory in Italy and prefers it to keep possession of just Lombardy. He believes that Austria's attitude is one of keeping Italy from gaining any independence. On the other hand, Source C is written by an Austrian Governor to Metternich. It praises Metternich's rule but at the same time recognises that the Austrians 'have insulted Italian self-esteem' and that the Italians want their own system of government. As an Austrian Governor, he may well be exaggerating the benefits of and need for Austrian rule.</i></p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>'The Vienna Settlement was harmful to Italy.'</b> How far do Sources A to D support this view?</p> <p><b>Source A supports</b> this view maintaining that it will 'bring nothing but misery to Italy'. It states that Austria's intentions seem to be 'to restrain all advancement or progress in civilisation in all Italian states'. The Count states that this could be avoided if 'Austria does just allow itself to keep possession of Lombardy, and allow that kingdom its own local government'. He writes of Austria's motivation being self-interest, which implies that it would not be to the benefit of Italy. It then confirms that Austria wants to avoid 'any new ideas of liberty and nationalism, stirred up by France, moving into the territories'.</p> <p><i>The critical nature of the source gives the impression that the Count was not a supporter of the settlement and, certainly his friend, the British Prince Regent, was sympathetic to the Italian cause. Thus, this source is unlikely to favour Austria.</i></p> <p><b>Source B largely supports</b>, given that the author, a Piedmontese official, might naturally be biased against Austrian rule, it is a reasonably valid comment. He would be aware that Russian Tsar was one of the architects of the Vienna settlement, so he could not be too critical of it. However, he argues that Vienna would not bring the peace to Europe, or Italy, that was hoped for. He feels it would lead to the return of conflict in Italy. His comment that the Austrians and the French 'will be back' is of course very perceptive, like those in <b>Source A</b>.</p> <p><i>He does support the hypothesis. He is clearly opposed to Austrian and French rule. The Kingdom of Sardinia was restored by the Congress of Vienna so it is perhaps easier for him to make remarks about partition when he now knows that Piedmont is not to be ruled by Austria.</i></p> <p><b>Source C challenges</b>, but does acknowledge that Vienna, giving the north of Italy to Austria, had led to some advantages for Italians, such as equality before the law and an absence of arbitrary government. Contextual knowledge might suggest that many Italians would not have agreed with this view at all. He also argues that the structure imposed on Italy might lead to the 'plague' of revolution spreading throughout Italy. However, some Italians might not have viewed it as a plague. This source does not endorse the hypothesis.</p> <p><i>Coming from the Austrian Governor of Lombardy, the praise of Austrian rule has to be treated with caution, especially as he is writing to Metternich. However, he is also perceptive enough to realise that the rule is only being maintained with physical force and is making Metternich aware of the future risk.</i></p> <p><b>Source D supports</b>, and is highly critical of the settlement. This is hardly surprising given the author, although he does have the advantage of hindsight. Cavour suggests that even good rulers could not have made it work and blames the settlement for the attempted revolutions/uprisings of 1820 and 1821. He also agrees with the author of <b>Source C</b> on the 'moral' aspects of the settlement.</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><i>Given his history, Cavour is likely to take this stance as a keen advocate of Italian unification, but he does have the advantage of using hindsight which justifies his view.</i></p> <p>Overall the sources are agreed that the settlement brought harm to Italy, but <b>Sources A and C</b> contain some aspects which might be seen to be more favourable.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast Sources B and D as evidence about the level of support for the Wide-Awakes.</b></p> <p><b>Similarities</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support of <b>large numbers</b> of people: ‘at least 25 000’ in New York [B] vs. ‘mass meeting’ in Baltimore [D]</li> <li>• Support is <b>organised</b> into torchlight processions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source B</b> shows support was <b>widespread</b> in and outside New York vs. <b>Source D</b> shows support was <b>limited</b> in Baltimore, where the Wide-Awakes faced considerable opposition.</li> <li>• <b>Source B</b> shows support was <b>enthusiastic</b> while <b>Source D</b> shows the Wide-Awakes in Baltimore <b>needing police protection</b>, suggesting their enthusiasm soon evaporated in the face of opposition.</li> </ul> <p><i>The sources come from local newspapers in different states, <b>Source B</b> from a Northern state, <b>Source D</b> from a Southern state. Both will be partisan, especially as they are published at the time of the 1860 Presidential election campaign. <b>Source B</b> is just before the election, <b>Source D</b> just after. <b>Source B</b> will probably exaggerate the support for the Wide-Awakes to rally support for the Republican Party’s candidate against Democratic opponents. <b>Source D</b> is likely to exaggerate the opposition to the Wide-Awakes, an essentially Northern phenomenon, in order to show its readers that their Southern interests will be defended. That there was any Wide-Awake activity in Baltimore shows how divided Maryland was.</i></p>	15



Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>How far do Sources A to D support the view that the Wide-Awakes were a military force?</b></p> <p><b>Source A</b> emphatically <b>supports</b> the view referring to ‘the military organisation of the sectional Republicans in their Wide-Awake clubs’. It refers to the one in New York City taking ‘the shape of an artillery corps’ and to the fact that Auburn is arming. The newspaper is clearly pro-Republican, and comments that ‘this is eminently right and proper’. It comments that part of the plan ‘is to drive slaveholders like poisoned rats into their holes and that ‘to do that artillery companies will be necessary’.</p> <p><i>Reporting from New York, this is very aggressive in its argument for ‘war on the South’. This shows how radicalised attitudes towards slavery had become, at least in New York. This is surprising, given that New York benefited greatly from the cotton produced in the South as it was the commercial centre for shipping cotton to the British market.</i></p> <p><b>Source B</b> <b>challenges</b> the hypothesis by asserting that the aims of the Wide-Awakes are ‘peaceful and political’, even though the New York Times admits that they would be useful, if an [unspecified] emergency required their services.</p> <p><i>The New York Times, now seen as the premier American newspaper of record, was very much a local newspaper in 1860. First published in 1851, the NYT was one of several daily newspapers in New York. Claiming to be non-partisan, it became pro-Union and anti-slavery once the civil war broke out. This extract takes a sympathetic view of the Wide-Awakes. The reliability of <b>Source B</b> is best evaluated by cross-referencing to other sources. <b>Source A</b> undermines its analysis while <b>Source D</b> supports it. <b>Sources A and D</b> are too partisan to be reliable. One’s assessment of the picture of the Wide-Awakes procession in <b>Source C</b> will affect one’s evaluation of <b>Source B</b>.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> can be interpreted either way. It shows ranks of uniformed men marching in rank order as a torchlight procession. It can be seen as <b>supporting</b> the assertion. It is hard to see such a procession as simply having political goals. On the other hand, it can be argued that it <b>challenges</b> the assertion. The marchers are holding torches, not weapons. They need torches to help organise a night-time procession and to create the desired political effect. They should be seen as fighting a political campaign, not a military one.</p> <p><i><b>Source C</b> is an attempt to convey the reality of a Wide-Awake procession in a picture rather than words. At a time when photographs could still not be printed in mass-circulation publications [the first appeared towards the end of the nineteenth century], visual reporting had to take the form of a drawing. <b>Source C</b> would seem to be a careful attempt to convey this reality, emphasising the size, the spectacle and the discipline of the procession. Its inclusion of political banners supports the description given in <b>Source B</b> rather than the more militaristic description found in <b>Source A</b>.</i></p> <p><b>Source D</b> <b>challenges</b> the assertion. The Wide-Awakes in the theatre are clearly intimidated by the crowd which is protesting against their holding a meeting at all. Even the fact that the Wide-Awakes are meeting in a theatre suggests that they were not a military force. Finally, no militaristic force would turn to the local police for protection.</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>Source D</b> was from a Maryland newspaper in the month of the election and probably after the election on 6 November. This is immediate reportage, as shown by 'last night' and partisan reporting, as shown by the phrase 'Black Republicans'. Despite its partisanship, <b>Source D</b> would appear to be fairly objective reporting as the crowd against the Wide-Awakes is portrayed as the aggressor without cause. The police are also seen as favouring neither one side nor the other.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence about the French proposals to the Disarmament Conference in May 1932.</b></p> <p><b>Similarities</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both agree that the French have put forward proposals for an army/forces to be at the disposal of the League.</li> <li>• Both consider the proposals controversial.</li> <li>• Countries will hand over weapons/armaments to the League.</li> <li>• Both consider the kind of weapons ('most powerful' in <b>Source C</b> and 'largest type of planes' in <b>Source B</b>) which will be handed over to the League.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• League will have control of all armaments in <b>Source C</b> but only certain armaments in <b>Source B</b> – the rest will remain under the control of the states.</li> <li>• French plans are seen as imperialist in <b>Source C</b>, and there is a more positive tone in <b>Source B</b>?</li> <li>• Mentions protocol in <b>Source B</b> which will see the League coming to the defence of victims of aggression – seems to suggest that this is likely whereas <b>Source C</b> still thinks that only disarmament will help to save the world from war.</li> </ul> <p><b>Source B</b> is a British source. The Foreign Secretary is explaining the French proposals to Parliament. Even Britain, as an ally of France, is referring to them presenting 'very grave and controversial issues'. Therefore, it is likely that the source can be trusted for learning about Britain's viewpoint on the proposals and for indicating what the likely outcome was going to be. In addition, Britain is aware of France's reluctance to disarm because of the perceived threat from Germany. The British are being cautious in their approach in <b>Source B</b> (referring to the proposals as 'grave' and 'controversial'. However, France is an ally of Britain and so their proposals are given consideration. Britain was also committed to the disarmament conference with Arthur Henderson as Chairman.</p> <p>By the time the Soviet article, <b>Source C</b>, was published the conference had already ended. The Soviet newspaper was clearly supporting its own proposal of disarmament and regarded the French one as imperialistic. As a communist country, it is bound to condemn what it regards as a 'capitalist plan' and it stated clearly that its proposal was 'rejected by all capitalist countries'. The fact that the conference ended without the French proposals being adopted suggests that while the reporting of the plan might not be totally accurate, the outcome was. The tone in <b>Source C</b> is much more dismissive. The USSR sees the French as imperialist and hiding their real motives. They see their own plans as the only sensible option. They have been excluded from the proceedings until this point and their attitudes can partly be explained by that. They are ideologically opposed to capitalism.</p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>How far do Sources A to D support the idea that France was to blame for the failure of the Disarmament Conference?</b></p> <p><b>Source A</b> challenges the idea and blames Germany, suggesting it is concerned about German strength and the relatively weak position of Italy. However, Italy can also be seen as to blame. The source makes it clear that they are not staying in the League any longer than they must. Once their economy is strong then they will be off. It also blames Britain for the same reasons as France.</p> <p><i><b>Source A</b> are notes on a speech. Shows Mussolini's attitude very clearly. He has already been aggressive in 1920s – Corfu incident. Suggests he is using the League to his own ends. Can support with contextual knowledge about rise of Fascism and Mussolini's foreign policy towards Germany.</i></p> <p><b>Source B</b> supports the idea by not saying France is to blame but suggests that the proposals are controversial and grave – not wholeheartedly supporting them. It offers challenge by saying that the proposals are not likely to lead to disarmament and is arming the League instead.</p> <p><i><b>Source B</b> is Simon explaining the French plan – he is careful not to dismiss it but very cautious about whether it would work. Great Britain is a leading member of League and supposedly committed to disarmament.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> supports the idea by suggesting that French imperialism is at fault and that France is only concerned with its own safety. Pacifism is a front. The source suggests that it is going to lead to a more dangerous world situation than the USSR's proposal to completely disarm instead. <b>Source C</b> challenges the idea by blaming 'all capitalist countries' as well as France and suggests all are intent on rearmament.</p> <p><i>The Soviet Union is not a member of the League and is suspicious of French plans, seeing them as capitalist and imperialist. Pacifism is seen as a disguise for other intentions. There is some justice in the attitude of the USSR as France is very concerned to have security against Germany. The USSR is also aware of being weak.</i></p> <p><b>Source D</b> supports the idea by suggesting the conference will collapse because France had no intention of taking it seriously. It challenges the idea in that (as part of evaluation) it is a British cartoon so is likely to paint this picture of France so as to avoid taking blame for the failure of the conference.</p> <p><i><b>Source D</b> is a British cartoon which is deflecting blame on to France. It is clear by this stage that the Disarmament Conference will not succeed and that the League itself was in serious difficulties.</i></p>	25