

---

**HISTORY**

**9389/11**

Paper 1

**May/June 2019**

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 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **15** 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.

**PUBLISHED**

<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>

**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>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B on Austrian policy towards Italy after the revolutions of 1848–49.</b></p> <p><b>Similarities:</b>            Both sources believe that Italy might rise again: In Source A it says ‘it possesses the strength to rise again’, and in B that Austrian policy will ‘rouse even more anger among Italians’.            ‘No mercy’ towards Italy in A matches rule by ‘a rod of iron’ in B.            Desire to ‘break the rich’ in A matches ‘all classes must be crushed, especially the upper class’ in B.</p> <p><b>Differences:</b>            There is a desire to gain the support of the peasantry in A, while ‘all must be humbled’ in B.            Source A applies to all parts of Italy under Austrian rule, whereas Source B refers only to military rule in Lombardy.            In Source A, Austrian policies should ‘ensure we remain secure in Italy in our lifetime’, while in Source B ‘the policy’ will create more Italian nationalism. By implication, this will make Austria in Italy insecure.            In Source A, the <u>current</u> Austrian policy is ‘usual security precautions’ only, while in Source B <u>future</u> plans should be for more repression.</p> <p>Source A is a report from the Austrian military commander in Italy to his political leader in the immediate aftermath of crushing the Italian revolutions. Source B is a British diplomatic report. The evidence of both need to be treated cautiously.</p>	15	

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	<p><b>How far do Sources A to D show that the revolutions of 1848–49 in Italy damaged the cause of Italian unification?</b></p> <p><b>Source A</b> mainly <b>supports</b> the assertion when it states that Austria will ‘remain secure in Italy in our lifetime’. [Their lives could be put in context: Radetzky was aged 82 in 1848, Schwarzenberg 48. Schwarzenberg died just four years later while Radetzky lived to 91.] It can also be seen to <b>challenge</b> the assertion when it states that ‘Italy has not sunk so low that it is incapable of resurgence’.</p> <p><b>Source A</b> is written by a military commander to his political boss at a time when the revolutions were not fully suppressed, as shown by the Roman and Venetian Republics. As a military man he is duty bound to call for the use of force to defeat the revolutionaries. His sympathy for the Italian peasantry is something of a surprise; it is best explained by a political strategy of divide and rule to set alongside the military strategy of repression. Source A is written at the time of his military triumph and thus unreliable.</p> <p>Analysis of <b>Source B</b>, a dispatch from a diplomat to his political boss, shows it contains two distinct elements: a report of the views of the ‘local’ Austrian military commander and the diplomat’s commentary on those views. The report comes from Turin, the capital of Piedmont. However, the military commander keeps referring to Lombardy, the Italian province under Austrian control and which adjoins Piedmont, which is local enough. The commander is wholeheartedly for a hard-line repressive policy towards the Italians, no ifs and buts, which is to be expected. The diplomat is more sceptical about such a policy. As the source is written by the diplomat, it <b>challenges</b> the assertion.</p> <p>Britain and especially its ruling class had a close, if sentimental attachment to Italy, home of Classical Rome and Renaissance Italy, and a diplomat living in Italy is likely to reflect such views. In addition, the recipient of his letter is Palmerston, who identifies with liberal and national causes. Thus, in terms of evaluation, this source is not a reliable account of how far the revolutions of 1848–49 affected the Italian cause. Later events might support the source’s analysis, but that does mean it was reliable in the context of 1848–49.</p>	25	

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	<p><b>Source C</b> with regard to the impact of the revolutions of 1848–49 broadly <b>challenges</b> the assertion. Though it explains how each of three models of Italian unity had been set back by 1848–49, nevertheless its final message is that these failures should inspire Italian nationalists. Written by a Spanish diplomat, a Catholic state from Rome, the home of the Papacy and by 1850 a force for conservatism, this is surprisingly sympathetic to the liberal-national cause. Overall, it is quite an accurate summary from a probably conservative source and thus more reliable.</p> <p><b>Source D</b> is the only Italian source. Its summary of 1848–49 is accurate, as is its analysis of the future needs of Italian nationalism. Its overall argument is a positive one and thus <b>challenges</b> the assertion. Given that both had taken part in the wars against Austria, which resulted in defeat for the Italian cause, one might have expected a more pessimistic analysis. Thus, this is a reliable source.</p>		



**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	<p><b>How far do Sources B and C agree on the purpose of the Crittenden Compromise?</b></p> <p><b>Differences:</b></p> <p>Source B sees the purpose of the Compromise as genuine, i.e. to find a compromise, while C sees it as an attempt by the South to entrench its position by amending the constitution.</p> <p>Source B sees the purpose of the Compromise as being limited and harmless as far as the issue of slavery is concerned, but C sees its purpose to be to more substantial – to extend slavery in the territories and to extend slave power.</p> <p>Source B sees its purpose to be to save the Union, while C clearly does not think its purpose is to do this, but rather to surrender to the demands of the South.</p> <p>Source B sees its purpose to be to genuinely find a solution, while C sees its purpose to be to trick and mislead the people.</p> <p><b>Similarities:</b></p> <p>Both sources see the Compromise as an attempt to address the issue of slavery in the territories.</p> <p>Both sources see its purpose to be to make some concessions to the South.</p> <p>Both sources come from the same state, Ohio, and from almost the same time, early 1861. They show that even within one section, opinion is divided. Ohio was quite strongly anti-slavery and therefore, Source B does not conform to the usual Ohio views. It is pro-Democrat as shown by its title and its final sentence, as well as its request that the Republicans give up their rash policy. Source C is definitely anti-Democrat. Taken together, Sources B and C are useful in showing how Crittenden's Compromise divided public opinion and each is reliable in expressing a certain viewpoint.</p>	15	

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(b)	<p><b>‘The Crittenden Compromise showed that, by 1861, the North and the South could not remain united.’ How far do Sources A to D support this assertion?</b></p> <p><b>Source A</b> The Northern newspaper <b>challenges</b> the assertion, despite its opening sentence. It argues that the Compromise restores the principle of dividing states and territories along the line of latitude agreed in 1820 as part of the Missouri Compromise. This restoration, the paper argues, should ensure Republican party support, as that was what they had argued for in 1854, just six years before. It is a Compromise which gives way neither to Fire-Eaters nor to abolitionists. By implication, it should be supported by all moderates.</p> <p>This comes from a newspaper in the North, which voted Republican in the 1860 presidential election. It argues that the Republican party can support Crittenden. Its evidence is its support for the Missouri Compromise six years before. Contextual knowledge calls Source A’s assertion into question as much had happened since 1854, not least the Dred Scott judgement of 1857, which made the expansion of slavery a national issue as well as ruling the Missouri Compromise unconstitutional. In addition, cross-referencing to Source C also weakens the argument of Source A. Source C strongly criticises the Democratic party and its plans, as shown by the Compromise. Source C puts what can be deduced to be the Republican argument against Crittenden. Thus, Source A is unreliable.</p> <p><b>Source B</b> This is another Northern newspaper which also <b>challenges</b> the assertion. It maintains that Crittenden is gaining support from all parts of the USA and that ‘the people are for it generally’. Its support for Crittenden’s popularity, however, is limited by it having to appeal to the Republican party to ‘give up their rash policy’. Overall, however, it believes that Crittenden shows that North and South could remain united.</p>	25	

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(b)	<p>The arguments of Source B are less convincing than those of Source A. As already indicated above, it is a Democratic newspaper. It has few, if any, Republican sources to call on, as shown by its need to appeal to the party to support Crittenden. Even its knowledge of Democratic party views is based only on Northern Democrats. As evidence of relations between North and South in 1860–61, it is unreliable.</p> <p><b>Source C supports</b> the assertion. It sees Crittenden as a Democratic party ‘trick’ to protect the interest of the South. It says ‘it is not a compromise’.</p> <p>This Northern newspaper report clearly represents the Republican viewpoint and thus is one-sided. Source C represents the ‘rash’ Republican party attitudes mentioned in Source B. Its use of language against Crittenden is quite heated and emotional. ‘Gross deception’ and ‘shameful surrender’ suggest that compromise between North and South is a long way off. Source C is useful and reliable in expressing one side of the widening divide between North and South.</p> <p><b>Source D</b> also supports the assertion. This argues that the Crittenden Compromise has already failed because neither the South nor the Republican party of the North could accept it, if for different reasons. The source goes further, arguing that efforts to reach a compromise are a Republican party trick to keep the South in the Union long enough for Lincoln to be installed. Then, it implies that the military would be used against the South – unless it remained united.</p> <p>This Southern newspaper clearly supports the South, as is to be expected. It illustrates how fearful the South was of federal government action against its very existence. Its use of rhetorical questions and finally capital letters ratchets up the tension and division. Contextual knowledge would question the implied portrayal of ‘Old Abe’ and his use of ‘the standing army’ in Washington DC. This was fear-mongering and little more. However, it does show how great was the divide between North and South in 1861. Sources C and D, when taken together, are reliable evidence of how the North and South could not remain united. Sources A and B are best seen as examples of misplaced optimism, of wishful thinking.</p>		

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B regarding the UN Charter.</b></p> <p><b>Similarities:</b> Both have doubts about the Charter: it ‘does not establish an effective international authority’ in Source A matches ‘it is a very poor and timid affair’ in B. Source A says the UN Charter replicates the League’s failures, which matches ‘not much is added to the Covenant’ in Source B.</p> <p><b>Differences:</b> Source A is quite critical of the UN Charter, which it says ‘fails to erect a single world authority’ vs. Source B’s slightly more positive attitude with ‘two great and beneficial differences’. Source A pays little attention to the actual UN Charter, concentrating instead on the failures of the League of Nations, while Source B moves on from the failure of the League to detail some improvements in the UN, two being identified.</p> <p>The two sources are taken from a debate in the British House of Commons very soon after the end of the Second World War. The sources are from different political parties so a difference of perspective could be expected. The actual difference between them is not great, however, both criticise the UN, one slightly more than the other. This can be explained by the shared perspectives on the Second World War, during which Britain had established a coalition government of the two main parties.</p>	15	

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(b)	<p><b>‘The League of Nations was certain to fail from the start.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view?</b></p> <p><b>Source A supports</b> the hypothesis. The Conservative MP argues that the League of Nations was bound to fail because it asked too much of sovereign states. The source asserts that ‘there was not a chance of success’, implying that it was bound to fail. States would inevitably put their own national interests and ambitions above their responsibilities towards the League.</p> <p>Source A, as a public speech by a party politician on a different, if related subject, cannot be seen as being a reliable source on a matter of contemporary history. Contextual knowledge should support that evaluation, e.g. it did have some successes in the 1920s in resolving international disputes.</p> <p><b>Source B</b> both challenges and supports the hypothesis. <b>The challenge</b> is based on the source’s assertion that the first step of the League of Nations was based on a vision which was later lost. This implies that the League was not bound to fail. <b>The support</b> comes from mention of the inclusion of the USA and the USSR in the replacement United Nations. As both had been absent from the League of Nations from the start, this suggests that the League was doomed to failure.</p> <p>As with Source A, Source B is from a public speech by a British politician at the time of the formation of the United Nations. He would want to use the failure of the League to draw lessons which could be applied to the United Nations. Contextual knowledge could be used to support both sides of this argument, the 1920s on the challenge side, the 1930s on the support side. Overall, the source is an unreliable analysis of whether the League was doomed to failure.</p>	25	

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(b)	<p><b>Source C</b> identifies three specific reasons for the failure of the League of Nations. One can be used as support, one for challenge, while the third is perhaps irrelevant. The <b>support</b> comes in the second sentence which states ‘there was never a time when all of the large and major powers were members’. The argument for <b>challenge</b> is ‘it became too much like a department store ...’. ‘The large number of member states which had very little power’ is more descriptive than explanatory. However, ‘Once Italy had got away with its attack on Abyssinia, that was the end of any power ...’ can be read as meaning the League had some power until 1935. Thus, this also <b>challenges</b> the hypothesis.</p> <p>Source C is similar to Sources A and B, except that it is an Australian MP who is making the speech to the Australian Parliament. Unlike those two sources, which consider lessons from the League’s failure for the United Nations, Source C focuses solely on the League of Nations and the reasons why it failed. This makes it more useful. Whether its arguments are convincing and reliable can be decided by use of relevant contextual knowledge, such as the crises over Manchuria as well as Abyssinia.</p> <p><b>Source D</b> clearly <b>challenges</b> the hypothesis, arguing that ‘the League succeeded in maintaining peace for a number of years’. According to the source, the League failed only from the time when its principles and strategies were replaced by the policy of appeasement [of dictators], i.e. in the 1930s.</p>		

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
3(b)	<p>Source D is a public speech by a French politician to the final assembly of the League of Nations after the Second World War. There are various elements of the provenance which can be used to evaluate the source. The speech is made by a French politician. France was a leading member of the League in the inter-war period. The politician is therefore likely to put a favourable gloss on its record. The speech is to the League of Nations itself, which is also likely to mean that the analysis of the League's record will be favourable. It's also a public speech – not that the public outside the Assembly is likely to have noticed. Nevertheless, the politician would have been more cautious in writing the speech; had this been a government paper, seen only by League members, he might well have been more critical. In addition, there is also plenty of contextual knowledge which can be used to help evaluate the source. Its assertion that 'the League settled many grave disputes' certainly needs testing against the events of the 1920s and 1930s. The testing is likely to undermine the assertion, making the source unreliable.</p>		