

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**  
GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series**

### **9389 HISTORY**

**9389/12**

Paper 1 (Document Question 12), 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     | 12    |

## 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     | 12    |

### Section A: European Option

#### Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1848–1871

##### Bismarck's attitude to Austria

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and C as evidence of Bismarck's attitude to Austria. [15]

The sources have a common provenance but can be compared because they come from different periods of Bismarck's career. Source A was written before he came to power and offers a long-term view of relations between Prussia and Austria. War is certain, Bismarck believes, and probably sooner rather than later. It is a matter of Prussian survival. Source C shows Bismarck on the defensive in Prussia although having just inflicted a major defeat on Austria. His priority is to avoid making an enemy of an embittered Austria. Like Source A, it shows Bismarck taking a wide view of politics. In both, Bismarck still regards Austria as an enemy. Candidates should question the reliability of the two sources. Bismarck's memoirs are likely to be very unreliable as Bismarck used them to justify his actions and decisions when in power. The story of the meeting of the war cabinet in 1866 seems to prove that point. Source A should be more reliable as it is taken from a record of what was presumably a private discussion which took place before he held government office,

- (b) How far do these sources show that, during the period to 1866, Bismarck was more concerned with Prussian than with German interests? [25]

**Context:** The politics of German unification in the mid-nineteenth century were extremely complex. In 1815, the great powers had established the German Confederation, consisting of 39 states dominated by the Habsburg Empire [Austria] to ensure revolutionary forces of liberalism and nationalism were contained and controlled. Prussia was a junior partner of Austria and almost as conservative. In 1833–4 Prussia established the Zollverein, a customs union, from which Austria was excluded. Economic factors caused Prussia to become a greater force within Germany; some Prussians found Austrian predominance increasingly irksome. Bismarck was a conservative Prussian diplomat and politician. In 1862 he was appointed Minister-President [PM] of Prussia to break a constitutional deadlock with the liberals in the Prussian parliament. A controversial appointment, he soon proved to have the political skills to lead Prussia into a war with Austria in 1866 which replaced the 1815 Confederation with the North German Confederation, dominated by Prussia. Four years later, Prussia fought France to create the union of north and south Germany into the German Empire. Austria remained excluded from this empire.

**Analysis/Evaluation:** Sources A, B and C are from Bismarck himself. Source C makes no explicit reference to Germany; Bismarck concentrates on Austro-Prussian relations. Source A makes one reference to Germany but only to place Austro-Prussian relations in context. D agrees with Source A inasmuch as they both accept that relations between the two states were a matter of importance for Germany. This is supported by Source B. However, Source C refers to the situation in 1866. Bismarck was concerned that Prussia should not be isolated and seems concerned about the weakness of Prussia in spite of his victory over Austria. He was anxious to accept the implications of a more extreme peace being forced on Austria because it would have European implications for Prussia. Sources A, B and C are from Bismarck but need candidates to consider how far he was consistent. Source D returns to the theme of Germany. The author is a modern historian who sees events in a wider context than Prussia and Austria. The most successful answers can be expected to be consistently analytical in approach with coherent, focused, sustained and balanced arguments, fully supported by appropriate factual material. But candidates should note that the relevant period is to 1866.

|        |                                |          |       |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme                    | Syllabus | Paper |
|        | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9389     | 12    |

## Section B: American Option

### The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

#### Daniel Webster's Seventh of March Speech 1850

#### Indicative Content

- (a) To what extent do Sources B and C agree on the reaction of the North to Daniel Webster's Seventh of March speech? [15]

Source B is very critical of Webster's speech. It argues that Webster was aiming to keep the USA quiet and in a state of equilibrium rather than addressing a great political problem, namely the issue of slavery. The Liberator sees Webster as a father resolving a quarrel between two sons by making concessions to each rather than deciding who was right, who was wrong. Source B also suggests that Webster is badly out of touch with Northern public opinion. Source C focuses on part of that public. It identifies a group which approves Webster's speech. It is a Northern group but an elitist group which it dubs the 'Cottonocracy', Boston traders who have grown rich by organising the cotton trade between the South and the UK. They support the speech because Webster recognises the arguments of the South over the Fugitive Slaves issue. Thus while B reacts to the speech itself, Source C considers the reaction of one small Northern group which supports the speech.

- (b) 'A disaster for the abolitionists.' How far do these sources support this assertion about the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act in 1850? [25]

**Context:** Daniel Webster was a leading Whig politician from the Northern state of Massachusetts who had played a major part in US politics since the 1820s. By 1850, towards the end of his life, he was anxious to ensure that the related issues of territorial expansion and slavery did not threaten the unity of the USA. By 1850, however, the issue of expansion had become more complex following the war with Mexico in 1846–48. Huge areas of frontier territory had to be absorbed, initially as territories, eventually as states. Were these states to be slave or free? The answers had huge consequences for the future of the USA. Webster's Seventh of March speech was a major attempt to help resolve the issue. He tried to put US interests before those of his section by offering concessions to the South. His speech helped pass a new Fugitive Slave Act, which was seen as benefitting the South. This speech shocked people in the North who had supported his leadership over many years.

**Analysis:** Source A is an extract from Webster's speech in which he criticises those in the North who had failed to uphold the Fugitive Slave law of 1793. Webster is blunt in his criticisms. He also says the matter is one of morals and conscience. This antagonised those Northerners who saw the very existence of slavery in the South, let alone its expansion to new states and territories, as a matter of conscience. This point is made by Source B, a Northern newspaper, which argues that, when it comes to the issue of slavery, there can be no balance, no compromise between North and South. Source C, a second Northern newspaper, if from what was then known as the West, shows that some in the North, in Webster's state, did approve of Webster's speech and thus, by implication, his position on the Fugitive Slave law. Source C, however, heaps criticism on these supporters, arguing that they do so only from narrow self-interest. Source D is an abolitionist's reflection on the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 made four years later. The author certainly sees the act as disastrous, if for the USA rather than just for abolitionists.

**Evaluation:** Three of the four sources are abolitionist. Each has a slightly different focus. Source B analyses the speech and how out of touch with Northern opinion it shows Webster

|               |                                       |                 |              |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 5</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>                    | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b> | <b>9389</b>     | <b>12</b>    |

to be. Source C concentrates on a small group of wealthy Northerners who support Webster's arguments. Source D reflects on how Webster's speech ensured the passage of a bill on the topic of fugitive slaves which until then was becoming less significant with time. They can be used to support each other by means of cross-referencing. Conversely, they can all be criticised because they are abolitionist. Both approaches are valid. Contextual knowledge needs to be used to evaluate the arguments which Webster puts forward in Source A. Northerners were reluctant to return fugitive slaves to the South, Webster was right. Uncle Tom's Cabin, published two years later, though fiction, was based on many such examples. By not returning these fugitives, Northerners were breaking US law and thus failing in their duties as US citizens to obey the law. The Fugitive Slave act of 1850, part of a complex compromise between North and South and passed by Congress, was a legitimate attempt to address the problem. The problem was Northern abolitionists did not see the new law as legitimate and were prepared to resist it. At the same time, Southerners expected the new law to be more rigorously upheld than the old. And the new act was tougher than the old, which further antagonised Northern abolitionists. The number of fugitive slaves dealt with under the Act appears to have been relatively small. More importantly, radicals on both sides of the argument argued more passionately, spoke in more dramatic terms for and against the act. In terms of the law, the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 was a disaster for the abolitionists. In political terms, however, it was almost the complete opposite as it revived their campaign against slavery.

|        |                                |          |       |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme                    | Syllabus | Paper |
|        | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9389     | 12    |

### Section C: International Option

#### The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

##### The League of Nations and the Abyssinian Crisis

- (a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B about Britain's commitment to the Covenant of the League of Nations. [15]

Source A is sarcastic regarding Britain's commitment to the Covenant of the League of Nations. While claiming that Britain will stand firm against Italian aggression, and encouraging France to do likewise, the British Prime Minister is depicted as doing anything but. Mussolini, depicted as a mad dog, is seen to be taking Britain for a ride along with France and the League of Nations. In a speech delivered during the League's discussions on what action to take in response to Italy's invasion of Abyssinia, Hoare (Source B) argues that Britain stands firmly behind its commitments under the Covenant of the League of Nations. He further claims that Britain will support the League in any collective security measures which it decides to take against Italy. He does, however, say that the British government will support the League 'within the measure of their capacity', suggesting that there could be a limit to the amount of support Britain might give. The cartoon is based on the opinions of the artist and the newspaper in which it was published, but is also likely to reflect public opinion in Britain. Source B, dated a month after the publication of the cartoon, seems to disagree with the views expressed in Source A. However, given the time and place of his speech, it is inevitable that Hoare would stress Britain's support for the League. He would not mention other factors (such as Britain's desire to maintain good relationships with Italy) which might have conditioned British foreign policy. The speech is generalised and does not commit Britain to anything. It could be argued that this is another example of Britain 'talking tough' but doing nothing.

- (b) How far do Sources A – D support the view that the League of Nations was never fully committed to taking effective measures in response to Italy's invasion of Abyssinia? [25]

**Context:** The first clash between Italian and Abyssinian troops came in December 1934 at a place called Walwal on the Somali-Abyssinian border. Thus Italy was being aggressive towards Abyssinia some ten months before it invaded the country. Abyssinia asked the League to arbitrate on the clash but the longer the league dithered, the more Mussolini was persuaded that it was time to take military action. As the situation in Africa deteriorated in the spring of 1935, Britain, France and Italy signed the Stresa Front. This was aimed at Germany, especially following the attempt at Anschluss the previous year. At the same time the situation in Abyssinia continued to deteriorate. In October 1935, Italy invaded Abyssinia. In November the League imposed limited sanctions, on arms sales finance and some goods. They hit Abyssinia harder than they did Italy. Oil was not on the list though the UK made some attempts to extend sanctions. However, the UK refused to close the Suez Canal to Italian ships. A month later, in December 1935, the British and French government drew up plans to divide Abyssinia between Abyssinia and Italy. These plans became known as the Hoare-Laval Pact. Before they were accepted by Italy, the plans were published in the French press. The public response to the Pact was so hostile, especially in Britain, that the Pact had to be abandoned and Hoare had to resign. Some in Britain blamed the French government for leaking the terms of the Pact. By May 1936 Italian troops had entered Addis Ababa. In July 1936 the League withdrew sanctions on Italy. In December 1937 Italy left the League.

|               |                                       |                 |              |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>Page 7</b> | <b>Mark Scheme</b>                    | <b>Syllabus</b> | <b>Paper</b> |
|               | <b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b> | <b>9389</b>     | <b>12</b>    |

**Analysis:** The main support for the hypothesis comes from Sources A and C. Source A implies that British reaction to the Italian invasion of Abyssinia was hypocritical – claiming to ‘stand firm’ against Italy yet effectively doing nothing and being controlled by Mussolini. The League of Nations, powerless to act without the support of Britain and France, is shown as being dragged along on the backs of senior British and French politicians. Source C accuses Britain (and France) of much the same thing: making promises to support the League while, at the same time, protecting their own national interests by undermining the League’s ability to initiate effective measures. Source B challenges the hypothesis, since it argues that Britain is fully committed to supporting the League and upholding its responsibilities under the Covenant. Similarly, Chamberlain (Source D) claims that Britain had given ‘whole-hearted’ support to the policy of collective security. He continues that ‘collective security has been tried out and it has failed’ – this implies that blame for the failure of the League to take effective action against Italy rests not with Britain’s or the League’s lack of commitment, but with a Covenant which ‘was beyond its powers to fulfil’.

**Evaluation:** Source A, the cartoon, was published in August 1935, before the League discussed what actions to take in response to the crisis surrounding Abyssinia. In many ways it makes an accurate prediction about how the British government would react: claiming to stand firm against Mussolini (as suggested in Source B) while doing nothing to support Abyssinia (as suggested in Source C). Source B is a speech made during the League’s deliberations about what actions to take against Italy’s moves against Abyssinia. There was much anger regarding Mussolini’s actions and it was essential that the British Foreign Secretary was seen to be supporting the League. Anything else would have undermined the League’s credibility. It is possible that Britain wanted to support the League in taking effective measures against Italy and that it was only after French refusal to take action that Britain also backed down. Source B, however, implies that this is not the case and that Britain’s own national self-interest would have made it impossible to take measures against Italy. Hoare’s statement that the British government would support the League ‘within the measure of their capacity’ implies that there was a limit to the action which Britain would be willing or able to support. Source C is an angry and emotional speech by an Emperor who feels that the League has let down his country, leaving it unprotected against Italian aggression. He blames the Great Powers (Britain and France) for failing to support the League in taking effective measures against Italy. Contextual knowledge confirms his views. Source D is a speech by a senior British politician which seeks to explain why the League failed to take more effective measures against Italy. In particular, it aims to justify Britain’s role. Collective security failed despite the fact that Britain had given ‘such whole-hearted support to it’. In fact, Britain had not supported effective action and refused to impose meaningful sanctions. Chamberlain is wrong to claim that ‘collective security has been tried out and it has failed’.