

---

**HISTORY**

**9389/11**

Paper 1 Document Question

**October/November 2017**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

<b>Part(a)</b>	<b>Generic Levels of Response:</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Level 4:</b>	<p><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.</p>	<b>12–15</b>
<b>Level 3:</b>	<p><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.</p>	<b>8–11</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<p><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.</p>	<b>4–7</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<p><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.</p>	<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>	<p><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.</p>	<b>21–25</b>
<b>Level 4:</b>	<p><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.</p>	<b>16–20</b>
<b>Level 3:</b>	<p><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.</p>	<b>11–15</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<p><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.</p>	<b>6–10</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<p><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.</p>	<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 political views expressed in Sources A and D.</b></p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p><b>Differences between Sources A and D include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source A</b> wants unity to be based on the rule of monarchs who are unaccountable whereas <b>Source D</b> wants a constitutional monarchy.</li> <li>• <b>Source A</b> wants to maintain the strength of the army whereas <b>Source D's</b> support for the army is conditional.</li> <li>• <b>Source A</b> is opposed to responsible government whereas <b>Source D</b> is for it.</li> </ul> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both</b> accept German unity.</li> <li>• <b>Both</b> are opposed to the use of force, Source A explicitly, Source B implicitly.</li> <li>• <b>Both</b> accept the existing state structure of Germany.</li> </ul> <p><i>Both are party political programmes, presumably intended to address the voters in Prussia [Source A] and Germany [Source D]. Any evaluation for (a) is likely to focus on this point: origin, audience and purpose make them unreliable as evidence of political views</i></p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How far do Sources A to D support the view that Bismarck had widespread support for his policies?</b></p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>A source which shows some <b>support</b> for Bismarck’s goal of a Germany united under a monarchy is <b>Source A</b>. ‘No weakening of the army’ also fits in with Bismarck’s aims and policies. However, Source A also <b>challenges</b> the assertion. The Prussian conservatives are against the policies of ‘blood and iron’ and the ending of ‘smaller nations’ which presumably means smaller German states but could mean Denmark – both of which Bismarck follows in 1864 and 1866.</p> <p><i>Source A is a party political programme from a right wing Prussian party published in 1861, a time of political crisis. Bismarck was a right wing Prussian conservative, if an idiosyncratic one, brought into power in 1862 to resolve the crisis of a deadlock between the government and the Landtag. He did so by simply ignoring the Landtag. Source A, a right wing source in an unrepresentative political system, will be of limited use and reliability in helping to decide whether Bismarck’s policies had widespread support.</i></p> <p><b>Source B</b>, useful in outlining Bismarck’s policies, provides evidence to <b>challenge</b> the assertion. It shows Bismarck is not worried whether he has popular support or not. Also he is prepared to ignore the opposition of the Landtag.</p> <p><i>Source B is a much-quoted report of a meeting between Disraeli and Bismarck. That Bismarck achieved much of what he outlined here does not make the source reliable. That the account is by Disraeli, a British politician not always known for his commitment to telling the truth, suggests it is unreliable. On the other hand, we do know that Bismarck did ignore the Landtag. The diary is dated 1862, by which time Bismarck was in office. Thus assessment of reliability could be argued either way.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> comes closest to showing <b>support</b> for the assertion when it writes of Bismarck’s ability to grasp what the people really want. This, however, is more about Bismarck than about popular attitudes, the whole source being focused on the man and his achievements. Thus Source C can also be seen as a <b>challenge</b>.</p> <p><i>Source C is a paeon of praise for Bismarck, written as he led the formation of a united Germany. To many of the middle class, Bismarck had delivered the goals they had been seeking. The article is pandering to this hero-worship. Thus it is unreliable.</i></p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>Source D</b> gives qualified <b>support</b> to Bismarck's success of 1866 and thus by implication to his policies. It is mildly critical of Bismarck's leadership of Prussia since 1862. Of the four sources, however, it is the most supportive.</p> <p><i>The National Liberal party was formed in 1867 by moderate national-liberals who were won over by Bismarck's successes in 1866. Their nationalism triumphed over their liberalism. They were prepared to forgive him his autocratic leadership of Prussia in 1862–66. Its qualified support for Bismarck makes this more reliable than Source C. However, it is published in 1867, when Bismarck and Prussia were reaping the benefits of their defeat of Austria and the establishment of the North German Confederation. 1867 was also election year for the new Reichstag. The National Liberals aimed to gain votes by showing support for Bismarck. Thus, though useful, Source D is not very reliable.</i></p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>To what extent do Sources C and D agree about the process of naming the Republican Party?</b></p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both say the meeting was held in Ripon and attended by a small group [L1].</li> <li>• Both see Bovay and/or Greeley as key figures.</li> <li>• Both say Bovay proposed the party's name to Horace Greeley.</li> <li>• Both say that the process was complex, involving a local meeting and the editor of the New York Tribune.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of people attending the meeting: C says 5, D 16 [L1].</li> <li>• Source C = just one name considered, D = other names mentioned as well.</li> <li>• Source C mentions three existing parties present, D mentions none.</li> <li>• Source C = process was prolonged, D = process was relatively quick.</li> </ul> <p><i>Both sources are reminiscences in time, both sources are unnamed. Source C is taken from a commemorative/celebratory reminiscence; while stating facts and providing few comments is still likely to romanticise the event. Source D is from a personal reminiscence of someone who claims to have been at the meeting. The fact that Source D claims to have provided an alternative to Bovay's proposal could well be an exaggeration. Thus both have only a slender claim to be reliable.</i></p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>‘The formation of the Republican Party in 1854 posed a great threat to the party system.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view?</b></p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p><b>Source B</b> challenges the hypothesis. It asserts that ‘the Republican party seems to me not to last long’. The short life of the new party expected by the author means that it cannot pose a threat to the existing parties, let alone pose a great threat.</p> <p><i>Source B is from the leader of one of the short-lived parties of the era. Chase, as leader of the Free Soil party, cannot be trusted when he asserts that the Republican party is little more than the Free Soil party with a few extras. This unreliability is compounded by the fact he is writing to a politician in the Whig party, the party most at threat from the rise of the Republicans.</i></p> <p><b>Source D</b> can be seen as either <b>challenging or supporting</b> the hypothesis.</p> <p>It <b>challenges</b> in that it concentrates just on the naming of the new party, mentioning no other party. It <b>supports</b> because it says that the new party will ‘combine the elements of all the parties opposed to the extension of slavery’. Either contextual knowledge or Source C can be used to name those parties and the electoral impact of the new party in 1856.</p> <p><i>Source D is very unreliable. It is an unspecified secondary source. The author is unnamed. He is reminiscing about events which occurred half a century before, making him an old man. Old men forget. Or they invent.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> provides evidence to <b>support</b> the assertion. It mentions members of three parties – Whigs, Free Soilers and Democrats – agreeing to work together. Admittedly, this is in one town only but this combination at least poses a threat to the existing parties. If replicated more widely across the North, this aggregation of groups would overturn the existing party system/</p> <p><i>Source C is another recollection from fifty years later. Cross-referencing to Source D shows one or the other is inaccurate in detail. Together, their account is only consistent in general. Separately, they are both unreliable.</i></p>	25



Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>Source A</b> can be used to <b>support</b> the assertion. Douglas maintains that the new party is ‘sectional and not national’, which is a radical departure from the traditional two-party system of national parties cutting across sections. The fact that the new party invites both Democrats and Whigs to join the Republican party confirms this interpretation.</p> <p><i>Source A is from a leading [Northern] Democratic politician, giving an initial response to the newly-formed Republican party. He is speaking at a banquet, which is a more informal occasion than making a political speech in an election campaign or in Congress. Douglas’s analysis could well be exaggerated, given his undoubted ambitions, both for himself and for his party. Thus Source A is unreliable.</i></p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast the views of Source B and Source C regarding the USA’s membership of the proposed new international peacekeeping organisation.</b></p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p><b>Differences</b>, which are more obvious, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source B</b> has grave doubts about the USA joining an international organisation whereas <b>Source C</b> believes the USA should join.</li> <li>• <b>Source B</b> warns of the dangers of the USA becoming involved in disputes across the globe as a result of joining an international body whereas <b>Source C</b> warns of the dangers to world peace and thus to the USA should she NOT join.</li> <li>• <b>Source B</b> takes a nationalist, isolationist approach whereas <b>Source C</b> takes an internationalist approach.</li> </ul> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both</b> stress the importance of the decision about membership of the UN for the USA</li> <li>• <b>Both</b> agree that membership of the UN will involve the USA in world affairs.</li> </ul> <p><i>Both sources are public speeches by party politicians to the US Senate in an attempt to win support for their arguments and proposal. The most relevant difference here is the position held by the two men. One a Senator, and thus a representative, whereas Roosevelt was President and had been for 12 years. FDR had just returned from the Yalta Conference. He had a much better understanding of international affairs and US interests towards the end of the Second World War. FDR was popular with many Americans as he had won the presidential election of 1944. Roosevelt certainly had much more experience in affairs of state.</i></p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>'During 1944–45, Americans supported plans to create a new international peacekeeping organisation.'</b> How far do Sources A to D support this view?</p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p><b>Source D</b> provides the strongest <b>support</b> for the hypothesis.</p> <p>Source D states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The USA is completely committed to creating a new international peacekeeping organisation.</li> <li>• The people of America are fully convinced of the need for all nations to work together to ensure future world peace and security.</li> </ul> <p><i>Source D is a speech by the US Secretary of State at the conference which launched the UN. The conference is being held in the USA. Given the audience, location and US foreign policy goals, Stettinius is bound to say that the USA supports the UN. Thus the source cannot be trusted as evidence of American views.</i></p> <p><b>Source C supports</b> the hypothesis, if more cautiously.</p> <p>Source C states that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The USA should join the UN.</li> <li>• The US Congress needs to support the UN.</li> <li>• The US people need to decide whether to support the UN.</li> </ul> <p><i>This source is from a speech to Congress by the US president following the Yalta Conference with Churchill and Stalin. FDR is using his experience and authority to persuade US Congressmen and, through them via the power of the media, the US people to support American membership of the UN. Source B shows that he cannot take the support of the Senate for granted. In that FDR's speech is far from upbeat about US support for the UN, Source C is a more reliable assessment of US attitudes towards the UN than is Source D.</i></p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>Source B</b> provides the clearest <b>challenge</b> to the hypothesis.</p> <p>Source B argues against US involvement in an international body because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It threatened US independence.</li> <li>• It would involve the USA in international problems across the globe.</li> <li>• It would require the use of US military power.</li> </ul> <p><i>Source B is the publicly-stated arguments of one US Senator. He is opposed to the USA's involvement in international affairs. As the source is a US Senator, it has some validity as evidence of public attitudes. However, the limitations of US representative democracy and especially the six-year appointment of US Senators mean that it could equally be unreliable.</i></p> <p><b>Source A</b> can be seen as either a <b>challenge</b> to or a <b>support</b> of the hypothesis.</p> <p>It is a <b>challenge</b> in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government officials were well aware that US membership of a new international organisation would divide US public opinion.</li> <li>• These officials saw the need to shape public opinion in favour of membership via a government-led publicity campaign.</li> <li>• The proposed campaign should focus on general arguments rather than the details of the UN.</li> </ul> <p><b>Source A</b> is a <b>support</b> in that the State Department strongly supports US membership of the UN; if it did not, it would not fund a publicity campaign.</p> <p><i>Source A is a departmental memo to the author of Source D. It is ambivalent – ‘public opinion will take a set one way or the other’ – and cynical ‘it is necessary to have a very intensive educational programme’, which can only mean a PR campaign. It is trying to make Stettinius aware of the realities of the situation. It is private memo. Thus it is more reliable than the other three sources, which are all political and partisan.</i></p>	