Cambridge International AS & A Level

Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

HISTORY **9389/13**

Paper 1 Document Question **October/November 2016**

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

© UCLES 2016

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 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.

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]

© UCLES 2016

Section A: European Option

Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1815–1871

The Failure of the Revolutions of 1848–49 in Italy

Indicative content

1 (a) Compare and contrast the views in Sources B and C on the role of the republicans in the Italian revolutions of 1848–49. [15]

Source C, written by a foreigner, was recording a contemporary conversation with a major figure in the government of Tuscany, clearly a member of the 'establishment' there. There was clearly strong criticism not only of the republican role in 1848 but also of the long term implications of their actions. Obviously this is a one-sided view of events, but from the type of person likely to lose status and position if the republican ideals were realised. B is critical of the republicans, but for different reasons. While indicating support for their principles, there was criticism of their methods, such as their failure to indoctrinate and to provide effective leadership. His radicalism needs to be borne in mind, but he was clearly knowledgeable about the political situation in Italy at the time.

(b) How far do Sources A to D show that divisions between the Italian states were the reason for the failure of the revolutions of 1848–49? [25]

A range of reasons for the failure is offered in all the sources. C indicates policy divisions and, of course, with the 'unjust' attack on Austria, divided views on the role of Austria in Italy as well. The reference to 'insurrections' is also indicative. Also mentioned in C is the fact that so many of the individual states hated each other more than Austria which made any unified action unlikely. B shows other factors such as the lack of leadership and comments on the failings of the social system and the failing of the 'regular army'. D comments on the lack of awareness by the radicals of the social and economic situation in much of Italy and mentions that many had little reason to support the 'revolution'. A mentions the very different traditions in many parts of Italy and the likely outcome of attempting to force them together as well as the great divide between the republicans and the monarchists.

© UCLES 2016

Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

The Impact of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*

Indicative content

2 (a) To what extent do Sources B and D agree about *Uncle Tom's Cabin?* [15]

The sources agree that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* has been a great success. Source A says the book has achieved 'such a ready sale' while Source D states that 100 000 copies of the book have been sold in a very brief period. They also agree that the book has strengthened the abolitionist cause. Finally, they agree on the talents of the book's author, Harriet Beecher Stowe. Source B talks of polished manner of writing while Source D mentions the marvellous power of her writing. They differ, however, over why the book has been so successful. Source B stresses the book's abolitionist message and the support of the abolitionist movement, which it sees as more important than Harriet Beecher Stowe's writing skills.

Source D, however, mentions only the latter, her 'marvellous power' to touch the heart of readers and turning them against the Slave-Hunter. Source B is from a state newspaper which, though from the Northern state of Pennsylvania, does not identify with abolitionists, whom it calls 'fanatics'. Source D is part of a speech by a leading anti-slavery campaigner and at the time a member of the Free Soil party. Sumner is likely to exaggerate the impact of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* because it strengthened the anti-slavery cause to which he was committed.

(b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that the publication of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* did little to help the abolitionist cause? [25]

Uncle Tom's Cabin was published in March 1852. Its author, Harriet Beecher Stowe, was a teacher from New England. She wrote *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as a response to the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850. In its first year of publication it sold 300 000 copies in the USA and around one million in the UK. The book was also the basis of plays and musicals and was thus seen by many more people. The book had a huge cultural impact, its characters reinforcing certain stereotypes, e.g. Uncle Tom himself as the deferential African American. In the 1850s, it also had a political impact, though how great that impact was is hard to determine, given other developments in race relations, e.g. the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854. Lincoln is alleged to have said to Harriet Beecher Stowe when he first met her in 1862, 'So this is the little lady who started this great war', but there is no evidence to support his story.

The sources divide neatly into either supporting or challenging the hypothesis. For the assertion are Sources A and C. Source A is a letter from the US president to a Mrs Greely. Note she is neither the wife nor daughter of Horace Greeley, the newspaper editor, though she might have been a more distant relative. President Fillmore, a cautious Whig politician, separates the book from the slave question facing America. He separates writers – and especially writers of 'the fair sex' – from statesmen. Works of fiction have little, if anything, to do with the practices of government, according to Fillmore. Source C is from the London *Times* and probably an editorial. The *Times* argues that the success of *Uncle Tom's Cabin,* an abolitionist tract, is likely to provoke a backlash against abolition. The book will excite the passion of its readers, according to Source C, but it will not win over the defenders of slavery to the abolitionist cause. Emancipation of slaves must come gradually, by consent, rather

© UCLES 2016

than be imposed by force. According to the *Times*, *Uncle Tom's Cabin* makes gaining that consent even less likely in the short term.

On the other side of the argument are Sources B and D. Source B argues that publication of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* did much to advance the abolitionist cause, if not really because of its own merits. Source D asserts that the book has skilfully articulated the arguments of the anti-slavery movement. Thus Source D argues that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* provided great publicity for a movement which was growing in importance, which is not quite the same as the book converting people to the abolitionist cause.

Two sources are from politicians, A and D, and two are from newspapers, B and C. Source A was a private letter from the US president to a private citizen on a non-political matter – though Fillmore does make a broader point about the slavery issue in the second half of the letter. He admits he has only glanced at *Uncle Tom's Cabin* when a more calculating politician might have wanted to give the impression he has read the whole book. This implies a rare degree of honesty from a politician. Source D is a public speech from a leading abolitionist, delighted at the extra support given to the cause by a best-selling book, the publishing sensation of the 1850s. Thus the reliability of Source D is open to question.

Of the two newspaper sources, one is American, the other British. The latter, Source C, the London *Times*, was already noted for its objectivity and reliability. Source C suffers, however, from being rather abstract and condescending. It is almost as if the British political elite is telling Americans how best to address the problem of slavery. It has no evidence from the USA upon which it might base a sounder analysis. Source C is a useful statement of British views. As a source addressing the question, it is much less useful, much less reliable.

Source B comes from a Northern newspaper and gives quite a cynical account of the success of *Uncle Tom's Cabin.* Its argument would seem to have some validity. Contextual knowledge would suggest that in 1850s America, the huge success of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* could not have been achieved by its publisher alone. They must have had someone's help and the most likely source would be the abolitionist movement. Source B is probably the most reliable of the four sources and helps strengthen the argument that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* did much to help the abolitionist cause.

© UCLES 2016

Section C: International Option

The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

The USA's Rejection of the Paris Peace Settlement and the League of Nations

Indicative content

3 (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and B as evidence of British reactions to the USA's unwillingness to join the League of Nations. [15]

Source A argues that the League of Nations would be severely damaged if the USA did not join. Other powerful countries might decide to follow the USA's example and opt out of the League. Small and vulnerable countries would have little confidence that the League would be able to provide them with protection and security against aggression by more powerful states. The USA's absence from the League would put Britain in a highly disadvantageous position for three main reasons:

1. As a member of the League, Britain might be obliged to go to war against an aggressor state as part of collective action decided by the League (under Article 10). With no such obligation, the USA would exploit Britain's involvement in war by taking over British trading agreements.

2. As a member of the League, Britain might be obliged to take economic sanctions against an aggressor state as part of collective action decided by the League (under Article 16). With no such obligation, the USA could continue trading with the boycotted country.

3. As a member of the League, Britain would be bound by its decisions on disarmament (under Article 8), while the USA would be free to build up its armed forces, especially its navy – this could pose a threat to the security of the British Empire.

In view of these concerns, Source A argues that Britain should consider withdrawing from the League unless all of the other leading countries, including the USA, commit themselves to it.

Source B seems considerably less concerned by the USA's reluctance to join the League. While Source A clearly resents the USA's reluctance to join, Source B is more understanding of it and, indeed, does not blame the USA at all. Source B sees no reason to be disillusioned by the USA's reluctance to join the League and nor does it even consider the idea that Britain should withdraw from the League in response to it.

Source A was written in 1919, before the USA had formally rejected the Paris peace settlement. However, it was already clear from statements issued by the Senate that the USA would almost certainly refuse membership of the League. It is a memo to the British government and therefore not meant for public scrutiny. As its legal adviser, the writer would inevitably have to point out to the British government the likely implications for Britain if the USA decided not to join the League. It takes the Articles of the Covenant literally and outlines the possible outcomes of Britain's commitment to them. It is implied that the British government should do everything possible to encourage the USA to join the League. If this failed, the government should consider withdrawing from the League to avoid placing Britain in an invidious position compared to its main commercial rival, the USA.

The speech (Source B) was delivered after the USA had formally rejected membership of the League. The speaker's view of the League of Nations is very different from that of the writer of Source A. Whereas Source A considers the immediate legal implications of Britain's membership of the League, Source B views the League in a less precise way – an

© UCLES 2016

ideal/dream which would gradually develop over time as the difficulties '*adjust themselves*'. The speaker argues that Britain should continue to embrace the League in a spirit of '*good-will*', accepting that progress towards the 'dream' will be slow. The absence of the USA is seen as a drawback, but no reason for disillusionment with the basic concept of the League of Nations.

(b) 'The USA's rejection of the Paris peace settlement completely undermined the League of Nations' prospects of success.' How far do Sources A to D support this view? [25]

President Woodrow Wilson had played a major role in drafting the Paris peace settlement and had signed the League of Nations' Covenant in June 1919. However, it was becoming increasingly clear that Wilson lacked the support of the Republican-dominated US Senate and that the USA would, in all probability, reject the peace settlement and refuse to join the League of Nations. Other countries had to come to terms with the fact that one of the world's most politically, economically and militarily powerful nations would remain outside the League, unfettered by the commitments and obligations which membership seemed to entail. Some historians have argued that, by failing to ratify the Paris peace settlement, the USA destroyed the League of Nations' potential for success even before it was formally established in January 1920.

In support of the hypothesis – Source A is heavily critical of the USA's reluctance to join the League, arguing that it would undermine the confidence of small and vulnerable states in the League's ability to provide them with protection and security against unwarranted aggression. As a non-member, the USA would not be bound by decisions taken by the League – it could continue to develop its armaments, carry out trade in defiance of League boycotts and exploit opportunities which might arise when member states were engaged in collective military action against aggressive countries. Source A argues that this would give the USA an unfair advantage over countries which joined the League, particularly Britain. Under these circumstances, the writer suggests that Britain should consider withdrawing from the League unless all the other major countries, including the USA, committed themselves to it. The fact that Britain was even considering such a course of action inevitably undermined confidence in the League.

The cartoon (Source D) is equally critical of the USA's decision to reject the Paris peace settlement and, by implication, membership of the League. It depicts the US Senate as a murderer, killing the peace settlement and destroying all hope of future international peace and security. The establishment of the League of Nations was an integral element of the Paris peace settlement; with the settlement dead, there would be no hope for the League.

In challenging the hypothesis, Source C provides the main challenge to the hypothesis. It argues that the League of Nations is progressing well despite the USA's refusal to join. The vast majority of countries have joined the League, and the writer is optimistic that WWI's defeated nations and even Russia will soon be invited to join. The implication is that countries have not been put off joining the League as a result of the USA's decision. Moreover, Source C argues that, even at this early stage in its development, the League has already begun a wide variety of activities which are vital to the wellbeing of mankind, in particular addressing the problems which existed in the aftermath of WWI. Source B also suggests that the USA's decision to reject the peace settlement and membership of the League is not a cause for disillusionment. It sees the League as a long-term project which will gradually develop over time as initial problems are overcome. Like Source C, it confirms that many nations have already committed themselves to the League, and the speaker is clearly optimistic about the League's future prospects.

© UCLES 2016

Source A – A formal memo to the British government, not intended for public scrutiny. The memo addresses the issue of how Britain should react if the USA eventually decided not to join the League. At this stage, the USA had not formally announced its rejection of the Paris peace settlement, although the likelihood of this was clear from statements coming from the Senate. As the government's legal adviser, the writer had a duty to outline the legal implications of Britain's membership of the League. The Articles of the Covenant are taken literally in terms of the obligations which they imposed on Britain as a result of its membership of the League. The writer seeks to ensure that the British government is fully aware of what membership of the League entails for Britain and how the country might be affected by the USA's likely decision not to join.

Source B – A personal view which sees the League of Nations in idealistic rather than specific terms. The speaker clearly does not expect the League to achieve much in the short term – he sees it as a long-term project which, initially, will be hampered by numerous problems, one of which is the USA's refusal to join. Over time, these problems will '*adjust themselves*' and countries will come together in the League in a spirit of goodwill.

Source C – The writer is clearly a supporter of the League of Nations and makes every effort to praise its early achievements. In many ways these are exaggerated – e.g. German, Austrian and Russian membership of the League was still some way off; while mechanisms were being developed within the League to deal with the post-WWI problems, they had achieved little by 1920. The article may have been politically motivated – the writer clearly supported Wilson in the debate over whether the USA should accept or reject the Paris peace settlement and the League. The implication of the source is that the USA was wrong not to join the League and was in some way missing out by not doing so.

Source D – The US Senate (Brutus) is depicted as killing the Paris peace settlement (Caesar) and being accused by humanity (the League of Nations) of destroying all hope for future international peace and security. The cartoon is a product of the debate which raged in the USA in the build-up to the presidential elections of 1920. The Republican-dominated Senate argued for a return to isolationism, rejection of the Paris peace settlement and refusal to join the League of Nations. President Wilson, in many ways the architect of the peace settlement, tried to gain support for American acceptance of both the settlement and the League. Wilson's heavy defeat in the election showed the extent of popular opinion in the USA against American involvement in the League. The cartoonist clearly supported Wilson and is heavily critical of the actions taken by the Senate.

© UCLES 2016