

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9389 HISTORY

9389/13

Paper 1 (Document Question 13), maximum raw mark 40

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 May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9389 | 13 |

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]

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 3 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9389 | 13 |

Section A: European Option

Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1848–1871

Bismarck and war with France

(a) Compare Sources C and D as evidence of the growing power of Prussia. [15]

For the purposes of this question, Prussia equals Germany. Thus when the King of Prussia asserts that ‘Germany has the will and power’, in Source C, it was taken for granted that that power was based on the economic and military strength of Prussia. Source C is a formal public speech by the Prussian king in the middle of a major diplomatic storm over the candidacy for the vacant Spanish throne, a storm which led to war between France and Prussia/Germany. William 1 argues that Prussia/Germany was using its power to put a German prince on the Spanish throne, to ‘create a lasting peace in Europe’ and to defend itself against ‘renewed acts of French violence’. Given that this was a formal public speech by the Prussian/German head of state, William 1 had little choice but to say what he did. Thus as evidence of German power, the source needs to be treated with great caution. Source D is an account of developments in the 1860s by a German historian writing soon after the end of the First World War. He refers to, but does not quote from, a French military official who asserted that in 1870 France went to war to secure its boundaries against the ‘growing power of Prussia’. In other words Prussia was the aggressor in the war of 1870. Thus there is a clear contrast between the two sources on the matter of Prussian power. The reliability of Source D, however, also needs to be questioned. It is unclear whether the French military official was a contemporary of the historian or a figure from the 1860s. If the former, a French military man in 1920 was bound to emphasise the aggressive nature of German power.

(b) How far do these sources show that France was to blame for the war in 1870? [25]

Context: The causes of the Franco-Prussian war of 1870–1 have been the subject of great historical debate. One school blames Prussia in general and Bismarck in particular. It is argued that he went to war with France to complete the unification of Germany by bringing the south German states into what became the German Empire. A slight variation of this argument is that Bismarck provoked France into declaring war but not necessarily to complete the unification of Germany. On the other hand is a school of thought which blames France in general and Napoleon III in particular. Facing growing discontent within France, he used the Hohenzollern candidature for the Spanish throne to make demands on Prussia which would score either a diplomatic or military victory. A third school sees the war as more accidental and unintended by either side. The withdrawal of the candidature by Prussia after the news had been leaked was a diplomatic defeat for Prussia which Bismarck was determined to reverse. Thus he edited the Ems Telegram, which provoked France into going to war. Did Bismarck intend to push France into war?

Analysis: Source A indicates Bismarck’s beliefs three years before the war broke out. This is presumably a private conversation to a fellow politician. He sees France as vain and possibly threatening but does not see conflict as inevitable because neither side has vital interests which require war. And Bismarck would advise war only if such interests were threatened. Neither personal ambition nor national vanity was an adequate reason for going to war. Source B is an official statement from the French government announcing the declaration of war against Prussia. France believed that vital national interests were been threatened by German efforts to have a Hohenzollern king of Spain. In order to defend the honour of France, war was necessary. Source C is the German equivalent of Source B. Both sources took place on the same day. The King of Prussia addresses the North German parliament, maintaining that Germany, now stronger and more united than ever, will resist French

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9389 | 13 |

aggression. It also mentions honour, in the context of past defeats inflicted on Germany, presumably by France. Source D refers to a French official blaming Prussia for the outbreak of war in 1870. The source thus joins Source B in blaming Prussia rather than France. The other two sources, both German, see France as causing the war.

Evaluation: The two public statements declaring war, Sources B and C, could be discounted because they are justifications for the respective decisions to go to war. One might be more reliable than the other, however. The assertions made by France in Source B have some evidence to support them. From the perspective of 1870, the Hohenzollern candidature for the Spanish throne would seem to ‘threaten the territorial security of France’ and ‘the general balance of power in Europe’ by greatly expanding German influence in western Europe. Some of the speech of William 1 in Source C is open to question. Was the Hohenzollern candidature really ‘an excuse for France to find a cause of war’ with Prussia? Source A, from Bismarck, suggests France would provoke war – but Bismarck is a German source. Many in France argued that ‘it was France which was defeated at Sadowa’ [the main battle of the Austro-Prussian war], a defeat which many would want to avenge. ‘The sword has been forced into our hand’ implies that France was forcing Prussia to fight. Prussia could always have refused this imposition – or at least delayed making moves to war rather than react on the same day as the French announcement of war. By 1870, however, the growing strength of German nationalism also forced the Prussian leadership to take up the sword of war. Source A, from a peace-loving Bismarck, argues that Bismarck would never go to war for reasons of personal ambition or national vanity and yet the 1870 war could be seen as a war of national vanity. Source D is an unusual source. It is a German historian quoting a Frenchman that Prussia was to blame for the war. You would expect a Frenchman to say such a thing but not for a German to report it, especially in the context of 1920. Thus it can be argued that Source D has a reliability which the other sources lack.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9389 | 13 |

Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

John Brown 1859

Indicative Content

- (a) To what extent do Sources C and D agree about Southern attitudes towards John Brown's raid? [15]

Source C, a Northern source, argues that John Brown's raid had two effects on the attitudes of the people of Virginia: firstly, it frightened them and secondly it offended their pride to have to admit their fear. Thus Source C's view of Southern attitudes is a critical one. Note that the Source focuses wholly on Virginia, the state in which Harper's Ferry was located in 1859. Whether these attitudes were replicated across the South is impossible to say. Source D, a Southern source, does write about the wider South. However, it focuses on how the South responded to the raid on Harpers Ferry rather than the raid itself. It argues that the South has acted vigorously to protect its interests, in part by acting swiftly to bring about John Brown's trial and execution. The Source also notes the 'large military force' assembled by Governor Wise of Virginia to prevent attempts to rescue John Brown, action which would have split the Union asunder. This point perhaps provides evidence to support Source C's assertion that the people of Virginia were scared by the raid on Harpers Ferry. Thus alongside the obvious differences between C and D, there are some similarities.

- (b) How far do these sources support the assertion that John Brown was insane? [25]

Context: The raid on the US armoury at Harpers Ferry in late 1859 was a very dramatic incident which did much to upset the delicate balance between North and South. John Brown, 59 in 1859, had been a Northern farmer and businessman who in the 1850s dedicated himself to the abolitionist cause. He had become involved in 'Bloody Kansas', the sack of the town of Lawrence in 1856 causing him to kill people in what became known as the Pottawatomie massacre, which in turn led to a conflict at Osawatomie in which his son was killed. He spent the next two years travelling the North trying to find men, money and materiel to start military action against slavery. He hoped that seizing the armoury at Harpers Ferry would spark slave revolts across the South. The raid was botched. That it happened at all, however, alarmed many in the South, especially those who feared slave rebellions. The rapid execution by the Virginian government of the raid's leader, John Brown, did much to anger the North. Many abolitionists saw him as a martyr to a noble cause. Others thought him insane to undertake a raid which was bound to fail.

Analysis: Source A is an extract from a Kansas newspaper which provides details of John Brown's earlier life. The Source shows how he had suffered badly at the hands of 'slave power' a few years before. His sufferings had 'crazed' him, made him a 'monomaniac', which could be seen as another way of saying he was insane. Source B, a Virginian source, argues that Brown was not insane, despite claims to the contrary. To support its case, it argues that Brown had received money from New Englanders, who would never give money to a madman. Source C, a Northern source, argues that both Brown's recent life and the Harpers Ferry Raid itself were evidence that Brown was insane, even if the South would never accept such an argument. Source D provides little explicit evidence for or against. In arguing that Brown was 'a hardened criminal', it argues that Brown had acted outside the law for many years, which is hardly compatible with any formal definition of insanity, certainly in the mid nineteenth century. As a Southern source, it is bound to be critical of Brown.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9389 | 13 |

Evaluation: The two Southern sources, B and D, do not see Brown as insane. Both Northern sources, A and C, argue in ways which suggest that they see Brown as insane. Source A argues that his life in Kansas had driven him over the edge while Source C argues that the Harpers Ferry Raid was itself evidence of insanity. However, Source A is a Kansan source, a Free Soil one, and thus to be treated with great caution. Source C, perhaps less partisan than Source A, offers one explanation why Southern sources argue as they do: Southerners – or at least Virginians – could not face the thought that they had been scared by the actions of a madman. This argument can be evaluated by a careful consideration of Source B. Contextual knowledge supports the Richmond Daily Dispatch’s assertion that Brown received financial support from Northern businessmen, which is what is meant by ‘confederate villains’. Another of Source C’s arguments, that the Raid itself was evidence of insanity, also needs evaluating. The Raid certainly failed in keeping control of the US arsenal for more than a short time. It failed to provoke further uprisings. It was always bound to. It was far too ambitious. The fact that Brown still went ahead with the Raid could be seen as crazy. Contextual evidence shows that many contemporaries thought Brown to be mad, among them Robert E Lee, the Southern military commander who was in charge of the US forces which regained control of Harpers Ferry and captured John Brown. Many in the North quickly turned John Brown into a martyr, especially for the way he met his death. Thus context supports arguments both for and against the assertion. In deciding which is more convincing, candidates need to provide reasoned evaluation of the sources.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 7 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9389 | 13 |

Section C: International Option
The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

The League of Nations and the Manchurian Crisis

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence about Britain’s reaction to the invasion of Manchuria. [15]**

Source B opposes Britain becoming involved in action against Japan for two reasons. As a small country with a growing population and rapidly developing industry, Japan needed to expand its overseas possessions. The academic argues that it was better for Britain if Japan expanded into Manchuria rather than other areas, such as Australia, which would have a greater impact on Britain’s own interests. Britain was concerned about the possible threat posed by Communist Russia. The Japanese invasion of Manchuria could be seen as helping Britain to protect itself against this threat. In writing to his friend, the British Foreign Secretary, the academic seeks to influence British policy. He feels that Britain should put its own national interests ahead of its commitments to the League of Nations. He accepts that Japan is ‘clearly flouting the League of Nations’ and that his suggestions are ‘immoral’, but argues that Britain should encourage Japan. He attempts to justify this by saying that Japan was ‘greatly provoked’ (a reference to the Mukden incident). By contrast Source C is critical of Britain’s failure to encourage the League to take effective measures. Japan is shown in uniform, marching over the helpless League of Nations and being greeted with flowers at the League’s headquarters in Geneva. Japan ignores its commitments to the League, as indicated by the papers (Covenant) lying useless on the floor next to the League. Britain (represented by Foreign Secretary Simon) does nothing to stop Japan, only trying to ‘save the face’ of the League. The League and Simon are drawn much larger than the Japanese soldier, implying that effective action could have been taken. Britain’s refusal to take effective measures undermined the League, with major implications for the future. Source B comes from a private letter and reflects the opinion of the writer. Source C is based on the opinions of the artist and the newspaper in which it was published, but is also reflects and informs public opinion in Britain.

- (b) How far do Sources A – D support the view that there was nothing the League of Nations could do in response to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria? [25]**

Context: In September 1931, Japanese forces invaded Manchuria, establishing the puppet state of Manchukuo. Western media reported the event, detailing atrocities such as the bombing of civilians, and public opinion was in favour of strong action being taken against Japan. China appealed to the League of Nations for assistance, and a commission was sent to investigate. The Lytton Report was critical of the Japanese invasion, although it stated that China had provoked Japan and that China’s sovereignty over Manchuria was not firmly established. Seeing the Report as a rebuke, Japan withdrew from the League. Under the terms of the Covenant, the League should have taken collective security measures against Japan. Economic sanctions were not viable since Japan would have been able to continue trading with the USA. Therefore, members of the League should have taken collective military action against Japan, but there was reluctance to go to war in defence of a far-off country. Indifference, fear and national interests conditioned the response of member states. With Britain and the other Great Powers unwilling to take action, the League was effectively powerless. A serious precedent had been established.

Analysis: In support of the hypothesis Source A implies that Japan was too strong to defer to any action which the League might take and that sanctions would have been impractical. Japan’s growing strength and need to expand is also mentioned in Source B. Source C argues that the League was unable to take effective action, not because of the strength of

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9389 | 13 |

Japan but because of its own weakness. Source D strongly challenges the hypothesis. The writer argues that Article 16 of the League's Covenant would have been powerful enough to end Japan's aggression against Manchuria if it had been rigorously applied. He claims that aggressor states, such as Japan and Italy, were not strong enough to defeat the combined power of League members. He blames appeasement and the reluctance of member states to take effective action for the League's failure to confront Japanese aggression and feels that this implies a fundamental weakness. Source C shares this view. In advising the British Foreign Secretary not to take action against Japan, the writer of Source B implies that the League was in a position to take effective measures. The phrase 'for goodness sake, let ... her do so in Manchuria' suggests that Britain and the League could have acted decisively, although it was in Britain's interests not to. The writer of Source A has little faith in the League's ability, or willingness, to end the Japanese invasion of his homeland, and predicts the League's weak response in the sarcastic phrase 'a couple of disapproving officials and impractical sanctions'. All four sources suggest that the League could have taken effective measures against Japan. However, the League was powerless to act without the full support of member states, especially the Great Powers, for collective security measures under Article 16 of the League's Covenant. As predicted in Source A and bemoaned in Sources C and D, fear of war, appeasement and protecting their own national interests prevented member states from taking such action.

Evaluation: Source A was written by a Chinese resident of Manchuria at the height of the Japanese take-over of Manchuria. He expects little constructive help from the League as a result of its own weaknesses and Japan's growing strength. Source B is taken from a private letter written at the time when the League of Nations was debating what action to take against Japan in response to its invasion of Manchuria. The writer is urging Britain to put its own national self-interest ahead of its commitments to the League of Nations, even though the writer appreciates that this might be seen as 'wrong, perhaps even immoral'. Source C was published at a time when it had become clear that the League of Nations was not going to take any decisive action against Japan in response to its invasion of Manchuria. It is critical of British politicians, especially the Foreign Secretary, for not supporting the League in taking effective measures. Implicit in the cartoon is the fear that the League's weaknesses might be further exploited by aggressor states in the future. Source D is from a speech made after the failure of the League to take effective action in response to Japan's invasion of Manchuria. The speaker is critical of member states for failing to apply collective security measures (such as sanctions) against Japan, and argues that Article 16 must be rigorously applied against any future aggressor state. The speech was made by a Russian representative, whose country had a vested interest. Japan and Russia were rivals for control of parts of China, including Manchuria, and had been potential enemies since the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5. Soviet Russia was isolated in terms of international relations in 1934 and, interestingly, the writer of Source B sees Soviet Russia as a potential threat to Britain.