

---

**HISTORY**

**9389/12**

Paper 1 Document Question

**May/June 2018**

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 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

IGCSE™ is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **12** 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.

<b>Part (a)</b>	<b>Generic Levels of Response</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<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>

**PUBLISHED**

<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>

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast the views in Sources A and B on Mazzini and the Roman Republic.</b></p> <p><b>Differences between Source A and Source B include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source A</b> mentions the French attack as the reason why the Roman Republic failed, whilst <b>Source B</b> suggests the failure of the Piedmontese army was more to blame.</li> <li>• <b>Source A</b> suggests that it was not Mazzini's fault that the Republic ultimately failed, whereas <b>Source B</b> is much more critical of Mazzini referring to him as a 'dreamer' without any 'great unifying ideal'.</li> <li>• <b>Source A</b> suggests there were some achievements of the Republic, whereas <b>Source B</b> feels that not much was really achieved.</li> </ul> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both suggest that some feared social change – 'conservative landlords feared what it might bring' (<b>Source A</b>), 'they marched to war under the banner of privilege and Catholicism' (<b>Source B</b>).</li> <li>• Both suggest that there has been an increase in a sense of nationalism. In A this is described as 'Italian feeling', whereas in B it is more vaguely described as 'Italian honour'.</li> </ul> <p>Source A is written by an American, who was actually present in Rome during the days of the Republic and thus probably a sympathetic insider; she has a slightly romanticised view. Source B is written by another contemporary writer, this time an Italian, who fought alongside Mazzini and the fact he is able to be critical despite being a supporter lends more credence to his view.</p>	<b>15</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>'Mazzini played a vital part in advancing the cause of Italian unity.'</b> How far do Sources A to D support this view?</p> <p><b>Source A</b> is, on the whole, very positive towards Mazzini and suggests several areas where he made a positive impact on the unification process – thus <b>supporting</b> the statement. He aroused international attention, and it was foreign intervention which was to play a key role in bringing about unification. The point about the Roman Catholic religion is a very important one, as Italy was a strongly Catholic country, and his stressing the difference between the Pope as a spiritual as opposed to a secular ruler was very important indeed. The source also makes the point that he encouraged the growth of a 'strong Italian feeling'. <i>Source A – from a diary written by an American, a known supporter of Mazzini's cause, who was in Rome at the time of the Roman Republic. It is balanced and seems objective. Obviously written by a foreigner, it might be seen to be above the obvious passions but it does have elements of being partial to the glamour of Mazzini. Rather than explaining what he achieved it tends to assert.</i></p> <p><b>Source D</b> is also <b>positive</b> about his contribution, although it does suggest that 'he had seen little of life'. The source stresses the importance of his ideas and the influence he had on those who met him and also emphasises his inspirational qualities. <i>Garibaldi was the third key player in the whole process, and of course his views have to be taken seriously. These memoirs were published many years after the death of Mazzini and the events in which Mazzini played a part and reflect Garibaldi's charismatic personality which went alongside the ideas of Mazzini. Garibaldi had also defended Mazzini in the siege by the French.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> is, of course, highly <b>critical</b> and sees Mazzini as a damaging factor to Italian unification. Mazzini is referred to as an 'infamous conspirator' and a 'major murderer' whose 'conspiracies and revolutionary ideas will destroy unification'. <i>Source C – written by Cavour, the Prime Minister of Piedmont to his agent in Paris. This would obviously be a confidential document to a vital member of the Piedmontese government and would be likely to reveal the true feelings of another central figure in the whole unification process. Of course Cavour was a politician who was allied with France and shows the voice of someone who is keen to maintain the French alliance.</i></p> <p><b>Source B</b> is also <b>critical</b>, but less so. He suggests that Mazzini was just a 'dreamer' with no 'great unifying ideal'. It also implies that his radicalism was unpopular and damaging to the cause. There is a partial compliment in suggesting that he at least tried to 'save Italian honour'. <i>Source B – also written by a contemporary, although which 'side' he was on is not made clear. It is quite balanced, and contextual knowledge would suggest that it is quite objective as well, as it seems accurate.</i></p>	25

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>To what extent do Sources A and B agree in their assessment of the situation facing Fillmore when he became President?</b></p> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A volatile, excitable time, rife with rumours (B) or politicians running hither and thither (A).</li> <li>• Lack of agreement between parties over the Compromise proposed by Henry Clay.</li> <li>• Both sides are unsure which choice Fillmore will make with regard to the Compromise.</li> <li>• The idea that Taylor had been a steady hand and was much missed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source A stresses the opportunity which Fillmore has to settle the divisions by agreeing to Clay's omnibus bill – so long as he is firm in standing up to the abolitionist clique.</li> <li>• Source B stresses the difficulties facing Fillmore as all sides lobbied – the main difficulty being his own passive personality.</li> <li>• Source A is much more optimistic of Fillmore and the opportunity he has, whereas B is more negative towards his character.</li> </ul> <p>Source A is from a New York newspaper which is critical of the abolitionist clique based in New York and led by Weed and Seward. This may be unexpected from a New York paper but adds some credence to this more balanced view. Source B is from Seward himself and you would expect him to be partial. The evidence of Source A, a New York newspaper, undermines the reliability of Source B, a New York Senator. Cross-referencing to Source C confirms the unreliability of Source B.</p>	15

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that, in supporting the 1850 Compromise, President Fillmore would unite the country?</b></p> <p>Only one source clearly <b>supports the assertion</b> and that is <b>Source A</b>. It argues that the Compromise ensures justice and equity for all parts of the USA. Thus if Fillmore supports the Compromise, he is doing the country a great service. Even then, Source A says Fillmore must resist the demands of the abolitionist clique in order to be seen as the saviour of the nation. <i>Source A is critical of the ultra-abolition clique, even though that clique is based in New York state, which provides the readership of Source A. In arguing as it does, Source A risks losing readers. The alternative is that the abolitionists are not quite as dominant in New York as most of these sources suggest.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> implicitly <b>supports the assertion</b>. It does not explicitly refer to the 1850 Compromise but ‘a just and liberal policy towards the South’ could only be the Compromise. Even here, the source has doubts about Fillmore’s resolve; there is a lot of conditional language about what he could do. <i>Source C, from a border state newspaper at the height of the crisis, is a fair summary of the situation facing Fillmore. Contextual knowledge tells us that Fillmore could withstand the pressure of his own section. His acceptance of the 1850 Compromise did help to uphold the unity of the USA, albeit for no more than a decade.</i></p> <p><b>Source B</b> also makes no direct reference to the Compromise. However, it paints a picture of division and drift in Washington DC while Fillmore is portrayed as a Hamlet-like figure and therefore <b>challenges the assertion</b>. The underlying message of Source B is that Fillmore, even if he did support the Compromise, still would not be able to unite the country. <i>Source B criticises Fillmore for doing nothing but listen to all sides of the dispute. This was a wise move, not feeble, as portrayed. We know that after listening, Fillmore did act. Thus Source B is also unreliable in its portrait of Fillmore.</i></p> <p><b>Source D</b> is more explicit in describing how Fillmore’s support for the Compromise divided the Whig party and thus, by implication, the country. Source D clearly <b>challenges the assertion</b>. <i>Source D is the quite partisan source. Not only is it a belated autobiography, apparently written some forty years after the event, but it is then edited by the author’s daughter. Family loyalty means that she is more than likely to exaggerate the role of her father in the events of 1850. Source D portrays Weed as a man of principle in contrast to Fillmore, the weak, unprincipled compromiser.</i></p>	25

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p data-bbox="331 217 1733 248"><b>Compare and contrast the views of Sources A and B regarding the causes of the crisis in Manchuria.</b></p> <p data-bbox="331 288 909 320"><b>Differences between the sources include:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="389 323 1951 491" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="389 323 1951 387">• <b>Source A</b> blames Japan for the crisis claiming it has ignored its treaty obligations, whereas <b>Source B</b> blames China for the crisis claiming that the Chinese government was determined to end Japanese rights in Manchuria.</li> <li data-bbox="389 391 1951 422">• <b>Source A</b> makes a big deal of the violence involved in the affair, whereas there is little mention of this in <b>Source B</b>.</li> <li data-bbox="389 426 1951 491">• <b>Source A</b> overall has a more critical tone with regard to the League, whereas <b>Source B</b> dismisses the criticism that has been raised in order to appeal to the League.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="331 531 611 563"><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="389 566 1951 703" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="389 566 1951 630">• Both governments claim to support the work of the League of Nations and be committed to membership; however, there is implicit criticism of the effectiveness of the League.</li> <li data-bbox="389 633 1951 703">• Both governments use the same argument to justify their respective positions – they are simply acting in self-defence to protect their treaty rights. Both claim that the other side had consistently sought to destroy these treaty rights.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="331 738 1951 866">Both sources are inevitably biased, seeing the situation in Manchuria from their own viewpoint only. China believed that Manchuria was part of Chinese territory and that Japan's aim to increase its power and influence in Manchuria was a threat to Chinese sovereignty. Japan claimed that China was seeking to terminate Japanese interests in Manchuria, even though these were protected by treaty rights.</p>	15

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>'In the period from September 1931 to February 1933, the League of Nations took effective action over the crisis in Manchuria.'</b> How far do Sources A to D support this view?</p> <p><b>In support of the hypothesis:</b></p> <p>The Japanese government (<b>Source B</b>) claims that the League's actions had prevented the Manchurian crisis from developing into open warfare between China and Japan. This would suggest that the League had been at least partially successful in its attempts to encourage negotiations between the two countries.</p> <p>The author of <b>Source D</b> claims that the League had passed various resolutions on the crisis in Manchuria, and that these had been effective in '<i>achieving measures of agreement</i>', as suggested in Source B. <b>Source D</b> stresses that the League had drawn up a report, containing recommendations, which was accepted by all member states with the exception of Japan. He argues that, throughout, the League had acted properly and in line with '<i>internationally set principles</i>', and that the recommendations in its report were both '<i>just and proper</i>'.</p> <p><b>In challenging the hypothesis:</b></p> <p>The Chinese government (<b>Source A</b>) clearly implies that the League's attempts to end hostilities and initiate negotiations had been ineffective. Japan, it argues, had '<i>rejected every avenue to peace</i>' and was continuing its military action in Manchuria and, indeed, elsewhere in China.</p> <p>Despite its own claims, the Japanese government (<b>Source B</b>) admits that '<i>voices have been raised in some quarters criticising the effectiveness of the League</i>'. The implication of this statement is that criticism of the League's actions was not confined to China.</p> <p>It is clear from <b>Source C</b> that Japan did not accept the League's decision. Despite the unanimity of the League's member states, Japan simply refused to comply with the recommendations in the League's report and withdrew from the League in protest. The fact that the Japanese government felt confident enough to maintain its military occupation of Manchuria and simply withdraw from the League shows that Japan believed there was nothing the League could do about it.</p> <p>The author of <b>Source D</b> admits that the League's attempts to end hostilities and encourage negotiations had been difficult because of '<i>Japan's military occupation of Chinese territory</i>'. This would imply that the Japanese government had simply refused to compromise by withdrawing its troops from Manchuria, supporting <b>Source A's</b> claim that Japan had rejected all attempts at negotiation.</p>	25

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
3(b)	<p><b>Evaluation:</b></p> <p><i>Source A – The Chinese government is stating its case to the League of Nations, whose support it is requesting. Inevitably, therefore, it is seeking to lay the entire blame for the crisis on Japan. It uses emotive language to describe the strategies employed by Japanese troops (e.g. killing of innocent men, women and children; ‘the sky has been red with the glare of burning cities and villages’, ‘the tramp of Japan’s armies and the thunder of its guns’).</i></p> <p><i>Source B – The Japanese government is stating its case to the League of Nations, claiming that it is only protecting its legal rights, which have been threatened by the actions of the Chinese. It argues that the Chinese have used propaganda to turn world opinion against Japan. It stresses that Japan wants to work closely with the League of Nations and that its main desire is peace in the region. These are biased statements designed to gain the support of League members.</i></p> <p><i>Source C – Japan’s formal statement to the League of Nations Assembly regarding its decision to withdraw from the League. It questions the validity of the League’s Report on Manchuria, arguing that Manchuria rightly belongs to Japan because of existing treaty rights. The implication that Japan had cooperated with the League over the crisis in Manchuria prior to the issue of its Report is contradicted in Source D.</i></p> <p><i>Source D – As an advisor to the League of Nations on international law, the author is keen to demonstrate that the League has acted properly, and in accordance with international law, throughout the crisis. He is essentially defending the League against criticism for its failure to gain compliance from the Japanese.</i></p>	<b>25</b>