

---

**HISTORY**

**9389/13**

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 views in Sources B and C on the German constitution.</b></p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p><b>Differences between Source B and Source C include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source B</b> is in favour of the idea of a constitution but is concerned that Prussia will just undermine it whilst <b>Source C</b> feels that the ideas that underpin a constitution, such as unity, are more important.</li> <li>• Differences are mainly those of emphasis on what sort of Germany would be created by a constitution (a federal country in <b>Source B</b>) or what would create a constitution (unity in <b>Source C</b>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources are in favour of a constitution in some way.</li> <li>• Both sources imply that a constitution should not be imposed but come from ‘the people’, although they may mean different things by this.</li> </ul> <p><i>Provenance here is interesting because of the similarity between the authors of both sources. As both are radical members of the Frankfurt Parliament we would expect them to have similar positive views of a constitution. Contextual knowledge can be used to support this similarity. However, they also show a difference in emphasis, and knowledge of the discussions which took place during the course of the Frankfurt Parliament could be used to explain these.</i></p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>How far do Sources A to D show that the desire for unity was the most important cause of unrest in Germany in 1848?</b></p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p><b>Source A</b> clearly <b>disagrees</b> with the hypothesis suggesting that social factors are more important in causing unrest than ideas about unity. Although the source is written in 1847 it may still be useful to look at underlying factors. <i>At the time Bismarck was a landowner and civil servant who is likely to have known the social situation he speaks of. In this source, to his wife, he has no real reason to exaggerate the ideas.</i></p> <p><b>Source B</b> does have the ambition of creating a ‘federal German state’ which can be used to show <b>agreement</b> with the hypothesis, but there are other motives for unrest as well and it suggests that the Prussian desire for domination could be a factor. The author is anxious to bring in the advantages of constitutionalism and the ‘freedoms’ it would bring; very much a middle-class aspiration. <i>Written by a ‘radical’ but still a member of the Frankfurt Parliament so likely to be middle class. His aspiration of a federal Germany may suggest unity but also a ‘top-down’ process which does not speak to popular Nationalism.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> sees unity as the primary objective, although it does not mention unrest. At the same time he is aware that others prize equality, liberty and freedom and see them as their main ambition. <i>Again as a member of the Frankfurt Parliament this commentator comes from a particular perspective and is not necessarily interested in the ideas of popular Nationalism.</i></p> <p><b>Source D</b> clearly <b>agrees</b> and stresses the fact that von Gagern, a known unification supporter, was put at the head of the new Reichstag. The author clearly felt it was very significant. The author, however, does stress that it was a ‘radical revolution’ that stirred up the masses, but the strongest desire was in fact for unification. <i>Source D, written by a known liberal, seems to be more aware of the wider causes of unrest. However, there is nothing indicating that he was anything other than an observer and therefore his comments are of less value than those of the three previous authors who were all major players in the events of 1847 to 1849. He is also writing after the key events and may of course be bringing some perspective to it all.</i></p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>To what extent do Sources A and B agree in their assessment of the Republican Party’s choice of Lincoln as candidate to contest the 1860 presidential election?</b></p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both have an initially unfavourable response to Lincoln and his candidature.</li> <li>• Both show Lincoln as defeating the favourite, Seward.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source A</b> does not change its view of Lincoln whereas <b>Source B</b> does.</li> <li>• <b>Source A</b> sees Lincoln as a weak, self-serving candidate, <b>Source B</b> sees him as a man of the people.</li> <li>• <b>Source B</b> calls Lincoln an outsider whereas <b>Source A</b> shows him on the inside of party politics.</li> </ul> <p><i>Both sources are contemporary newspaper sources which comment on rather than report the news of Lincoln’s candidacy. Source A’s case against Lincoln is based on an anecdote which is seen as a fact and thus limited in its reliability. Source B is one newspaper quoting from another, a detail which can always be checked. And the New York Sun’s expectations about the 1860 contest prove to be well-founded. Source B is the more reliable.</i></p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that Abraham Lincoln’s candidacy divided the nation?</b></p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p><b>Sources B and C</b> definitely <b>deny the assertion</b> that Lincoln divided the nation.</p> <p><b>Source B</b> argues that Lincoln is a man of peace who should win the election, especially if the Democrats remain divided. That outcome would not be possible if Lincoln were a divisive figure. <i>Source B is from a popular Republican newspaper in New York, something of a Democratic stronghold. Maybe the need to appeal to a wide range of readers explains the paper’s unusual view of Lincoln.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> argues that Lincoln appeals to ‘the thinking men of the South’ mainly because of his ‘admitted conservatism’. <i>Source C is another unusual view from an unusual source; a Southern newspaper argues the case for Lincoln over Douglas. The latter, however, is no favoured son of the South.</i></p> <p><b>Source D</b> definitely <b>supports</b> the assertion. It calls the doctrine which Lincoln expressed as ‘treasonable, fanatical and revolutionary’, urging all patriots to avoid supporting it – and presumably Lincoln. <i>Source D might be used to support the claim but Source D is too one-sided to provide much weight to the argument. Source D is an onslaught on Lincoln. It draws an extreme conclusion from Lincoln’s unexceptional statement about a house divided. It gains some validity from its Free State source, which might be expected to be more sympathetic to Lincoln. However, the language is too emotional, too heated to convince. It is probably deliberately emotional, intended to raise the feelings of its readership rather than provide a sound analysis of Lincoln’s candidacy.</i></p> <p><b>Source A</b> can be seen on <b>both sides</b> of the argument. It sees the Republican party as divisive more than Lincoln, which <b>challenges</b> the assertion. Lincoln is argued to be a weak figure and an electoral loser. However, it also argues Lincoln is an extreme abolitionist, which does make him a divisive figure. <i>Source A makes assertions about Lincoln which can be tested against contextual knowledge. Doing so soon undermines the assertion that he was an extreme abolitionist. Source A’s anecdote about Lincoln’s request for \$200 from Republican colleagues is impossible to evaluate in detail. However, it contradicts the ‘Honest Abe’ label which he acquired as a young man and which has never been effectively challenged.</i></p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and C regarding the USA’s involvement in the proposed League of Nations.</b></p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p><b>Differences between Source B and Source C include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source B</b> clearly opposes the idea of a League of Nations, and, in particular, American participation in it whereas <b>Source C</b> argues that the formation of a League of Nations is vital in order to secure future world peace and security.</li> <li>• The writer of <b>Source B</b> doubts that the League will be able to achieve its primary objective of preventing war whilst the author of <b>Source C</b> suggests that the League of Nations is the only way to keep peace.</li> <li>• <b>Source B</b> argues that the interests of the United States lie outside the League whilst <b>Source C</b> implies that they have an obligation to be part of it.</li> </ul> <p><b>Similarities between the two sources include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources recognise the intention of the League of Nations to prevent war.</li> <li>• Both sources acknowledge that US soldiers would be involved in sorting out disputes as part of the League.</li> <li>• Both are aware that discussions are significant to US foreign policy.</li> </ul> <p><i>The arguments put forward in Sources B and C mirror the debate which raged between President Wilson and his (largely) Republican opponents (such as Cabot Lodge). Source B reflects the isolationist viewpoint which gained strong support in the increasingly Republican-dominated Senate. The USA should put its own national interests first and avoid making agreements which might lead to American involvement in unnecessary future wars. The USA should determine its own future in line with the constitution, rather than being dictated to by an international organisation. Source C reflects Wilson’s more internationalist view, that the USA had a responsibility to help secure future world peace and security, and that this would be the most effective way to secure the USA’s own national interests.</i></p>	15

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>How far do Sources A to D support President Wilson’s claim that a majority of the American people supported the idea of a League of Nations?</b></p> <p><u>Indicative content</u></p> <p>The claim is made in <b>Source A</b> and so this should be tested using this and other sources.</p> <p><b>Source A</b> shows that Wilson himself was heavily of the opinion that a majority of the American people supported the proposals for a League of Nations. Although no evidence is provided to explain why he held such an opinion, the fact that a ‘huge audience’ attended his address does imply that he had considerable public support and can be used to <b>agree</b> with the hypothesis. That there was opposition to Wilson’s proposals in the Senate is also clear from <b>Source A</b> – the newspaper does not report any dissenting views to those expressed by the Senators quoted. The claim that Wilson was acting like a dictator suggests that the President was ignoring public opinion. <i>An article from an American newspaper, written at a time when negotiations at the Paris Peace Conference had not been completed. Full details of the draft Covenant finally agreed at the Conference were, therefore, not yet known. American public opinion regarding the League of Nations at that time could only be based on general principle rather than analysis of the actual implications of the Covenant. The article simply reports news without drawing conclusions or trying to shape opinions. For example, there is no explicit challenge to President Wilson’s unsupported assertion that the majority of the American people was in favour of a League of Nations.</i></p> <p>That the opposing Senators had some public support is clear from <b>Source B</b>, which clearly <b>disagrees</b> with the hypothesis. The letter clearly agreeing with Senator Sherman’s views regarding the impact on the USA of participation in the League of Nations. <i>A letter to a newspaper which reflects the personal views of the writer. Again, this was written at a time when negotiations at the Paris Peace Conference had not been completed and final details of the draft Covenant were not yet known. The writer has an isolationist viewpoint and clearly agrees with the (largely) Republican Senators who criticised Wilson for idealism and threatening the national and constitutional integrity of the USA. The letter aims to convince its audience to oppose the League of Nations.</i></p> <p>That there was at least some public support for Wilson’s proposals is confirmed by <b>Source C</b> which <b>agrees</b>. The writer argues in favour of the League of Nations by deploying very similar arguments to those used by Wilson himself (including the emotive language regarding the sacrifices made by American soldiers in WWI). <i>A letter to a newspaper which reflects the personal views of the writer. It was written after Wilson’s return from Paris with the draft Covenant, so full details of the proposals were now available for public consideration. The letter aims to convince its audience to support the League of Nations.</i></p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>Source D</b> confirms that, even after the publication of the draft Covenant, public opinion largely supported membership of a League of Nations in principle. The phrase ‘perhaps the flame of idealism does not burn quite so brightly as it did’ suggests that, at an earlier time, there was even greater support for a League of Nations. <i>The fact that the newspaper decided to conduct such a poll suggests that the League of Nations was perceived as an important issue which divided public opinion in the USA. By this time, the wording of the draft Covenant was common knowledge. The Republican-dominated Senate was strongly opposed to those articles in the Covenant which seemed to threaten the USA’s constitution and independence. It listed a series of reservations and required changes to the draft before it would accept the Covenant. These reservations were public knowledge and explain why the newspaper asked the question ‘do you support the League of Nations with reservations?’ Source D could also be used to cross-reference with Source A to show that between March and June public opinion did remain supportive.</i></p>	