

---

**HISTORY**

**9389/11**

Paper 1 Document Question

**October/November 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 October/November 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **14** 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>	<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>	<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.	<b>21–25</b>
<b>Level 4:</b>	<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.	<b>16–20</b>
<b>Level 3:</b>	<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.	<b>11–15</b>
<b>Level 2:</b>	<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.	<b>6–10</b>
<b>Level 1:</b>	<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.	<b>1–5</b>
<b>Level 0:</b>	<b>No relevant comment on the sources or the issue</b>	<b>0</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>To what extent do Sources A and B show that Cavour’s views on Garibaldi changed?</b></p> <p><b>Similarities</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire to prevent Garibaldi from ‘conquering Naples’ [A], i.e. Sicily and Naples, and if a revolution did occur in Naples, it should do so ‘without him’ [B].</li> <li>• Cavour sees Garibaldi as a leading Italian nationalist. In A, Garibaldi is seen as wanting to ‘free Italy stage by stage’ while in B ‘he has done Italians the greatest service’.</li> <li>• Cavour sees Garibaldi wanting to fight Austria: in A ‘His desire to throw out the Austrians’ vs. B ‘we would have no choice to go along with him. This might involve war with Austria’.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Source A, Garibaldi has to be stopped while in Source B Cavour looks to having to work with Garibaldi.</li> <li>• In Source A, Garibaldi is seen as working in his own interest, e.g. to have ‘dictatorial powers’ while Source B talks of the ‘service’ Garibaldi has provided for Italians.</li> </ul> <p><i>The two sources are identical in authorship and audience. The only difference is the date and that is a difference of just one month. The difference is explained by the speed of Garibaldi’s success in Sicily. Having landed in Sicily with his ‘one thousand in May 1860, by the end of July virtually all of the island of was under his control. By the end of August he had crossed the straits of Messina as was close to taking Naples. The sources are useful in showing Cavour’s ability to adapt to changing events.</i></p>	<b>15</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>‘The influence of foreign powers determined the fortunes of Italian nationalism.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view?</b></p> <p><b>Analysis and evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Source A</b> can be seen as <b>either challenging or supporting</b> the hypothesis. It <b>challenges</b> in that Cavour, while mentioning the Austrians, does not see them as a determining force in Italian politics. More important, whether for good or bad, were the efforts of Italians and in particular Garibaldi. It <b>supports</b> by mentioning Garibaldi’s response to Piedmont’s handing over of Nice to France. This particular French intervention provoked Garibaldi to oppose the Piedmontese government and to sail to Sicily in support of revolution. Developing this Support analysis requires good contextual knowledge.</p> <p><i>In deciding whether external, great power forces were more important than domestic, Italian efforts, Source A is unreliable. Contextual knowledge shows that in July 1860, Cavour had lost the ability to control fast-moving events in southern Italy. He was briefing his man in Paris, who presumably would brief Napoleon III, to show that he, Cavour, was prepared to stop Garibaldi, even to work against the cause of Italian nationalism, if needs be. The last thing he wanted at that time was for France to intervene in Italian affairs, on whichever side it might be.</i></p> <p><b>Source B</b> can be used on either side of the argument. It <b>challenges</b> by asserting that Austria, even if it intervenes in Italy, can be beaten by Italian forces. It <b>supports</b> the assertion in that it shows Austria affecting the course of events in Italy, if not necessarily determining Italian fortunes. The main message of Source B supports the former more than the latter.</p> <p><i>Source B, from the same author to the same recipient as Source A, has an importantly different message when it comes to the hypothesis. It argues that Italians could come together, if faced with Austrian intervention. Cavour is now suggesting that Piedmont in the north might be forced to cooperate with Garibaldi in the south. Both the rest of Source B and contextual knowledge of events before August 1861 would suggest this was a very optimistic view, making the source unreliable. After that date, Italians did cooperate but evidence from the future cannot strictly be used to confirm earlier assertions.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> is full of praise for Garibaldi. The foreign journalist asserts that, while he had succeeded in the south, greater challenges awaited in the north. Its main message, therefore, is that ‘without... the bayonets of France’ little would happen to advance the Italian cause. Thus the source <b>supports</b> the hypothesis. Admittedly, ‘the power of Milan’, an Italian city, is also mentioned but that, presumably, alludes to economic power. [Milan became part of Piedmont in 1859, after the Austro-French war, which is too recent to equate the city and the state.]</p>	<b>25</b>

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1(b)	<p><i>Source C is a memoir of Garibaldi written in 1861 by a Swiss journalist who had accompanied the Italian in his conquest of Naples the year before. This accounts for his praise of Garibaldi. When it comes to the fortunes of Italian nationalism however, writing in 1861 meant that the author had seen Italy unite itself without the help of Austria. This makes his analysis of the situation in 1860 more reliable; he had not changed his analysis in the light of more recent events.</i></p> <p><b>Source D</b>, from Garibaldi himself, both <b>supports</b> and <b>challenges</b> the hypothesis. It <b>supports</b> because it says that British ships helped ensure Garibaldi's forces reached land [whether in Sicily or the mainland is unclear]. However, it <b>challenges</b> the hypothesis by dismissing the importance of English [sic] assistance as a claim put about by his critics. The latter argument is the main message of the source.</p> <p><i>As an account of the fortunes of Italy, Source D is very unreliable and in several ways. In terms of content, the undeniable facts concerning the English fleet are responded to by mere assertion from Garibaldi, making his argument unreliable. The source is also an autobiography, a notoriously unreliable form of history. Finally, it is published in 1889, almost thirty years after the events described.</i></p>	



**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence about Davis’s journey from Mississippi to Montgomery.</b></p> <p><b>Similarities include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both describe crowds along the way</li> <li>• Both describe addressing the crowds</li> <li>• Both say Davis addresses to the crowds were brief.</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Source B says the ovations were continuous, implying that there were crowds all along the way, whereas Source C says the train stopped only where crowds had gathered, i.e. there were times when there were no crowds.</li> <li>• Source B states that the stops took place at various stations on the route whereas Source C says the stops occurred only where crowds had gathered – which were not necessarily at stations.</li> <li>• Source B says Davis made aggressive speeches, Source D denies that he did so.</li> </ul> <p><i>Source B is from a contemporary newspaper published in the border state of Maryland, Source C a later history/autobiography by Davis himself. Source C will almost certainly aim to justify the actions of the author. The final sentence of Source C undermines the author’s position, as explained below. Does Source B count as a Northern newspaper, about which Source C complains? Strictly, not, as Maryland is a slave state. Source B does contradict Source C’s claim about being misreported.</i></p>	<b>15</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>How far do Sources A to D support the view that Jefferson Davis had the qualities needed to be a war leader?</b></p> <p><b>Analysis and Evaluation:</b></p> <p>Note: Answering this question depends more than usual on defining key terms, in this case ‘war leader’. It can be defined solely as a military leader, the leader of armies. The other definition would include civilian leadership as well as military. Both can be credited, though the second definition is the more accurate. Also, challenge and support is more clearly defined when considering war leadership.</p> <p>In terms of <b>military leadership</b>, <b>Source A</b> can be placed on both sides of the argument. It <b>challenges</b> in that a ‘stiff soldierly appearance and a reserve which is at first off-putting’, hardly suggests military leadership potential. It <b>supports</b> in that the final sentence asserts ‘he is <b>in every way</b> [emphasis added] suited to be the Confederate President’.</p> <p>In terms of <b>war leadership</b>, the final sentence of <b>Source A</b> shows it clearly <b>supports</b> the hypothesis. Source A cannot be used to challenge the war leadership hypothesis as the Best leader of the CSA was the best leader of a country at war.</p> <p><i>Source A is from a Northern newspaper, writing at the time Davis was chosen as CSA President. Its favourable reporting of Davis shows that some Northern sources were sympathetic to the South. [The New York Herald was a Democratic newspaper, though candidates cannot be expected to know that.] these sympathies will almost certainly affect the reliability of the account of Davis, making it unreliable.</i></p> <p>In terms of <b>military leadership</b>, <b>Source B supports</b> the hypothesis because it reports Davis talking of vigorous military action against the USA.</p> <p>In terms of <b>war leadership</b>, <b>Source B also supports</b> the argument. It includes Davis making crowd-pleasing speeches as well as providing vigorous military leadership.</p> <p><i>Source B is from a newspaper in a Southern border state which joined the USA in the civil war. This latter point means that many candidates will describe Source B as a Northern source. As a study of Davis, its reliability is brought into question by Source C, which disagrees about both the journey and the speeches – but Source C is from Davis himself, writing some twenty years later. Source B is essentially favourable to Davis, as might be expected of a Southern newspaper – though not a Northern one, if B is seen as such.</i></p> <p>In terms of <b>military leadership</b>, <b>Source C</b> might be seen as a <b>challenge</b> in that Davis denies his critics’ accusation that he was intent on an <b>aggressive</b> war against the USA. However, Davis shows no intention of avoiding a civil war. There is no clear evidence to support the hypothesis; Davis is more concerned with defending his reputation.</p>	25

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
2(b)	<p>In terms of <b>war leadership, Source C partly supports</b> the hypothesis. It shows him as making public speeches on the way to becoming CSA president. On the other, military side, Source C is silent.</p> <p><i>Source B is from a book written by Davis which was given a title which suggests it was a work of [more objective] history rather than a [more one-sided] autobiography. In reality, it's the latter. However, Davis's defence of his position is reasoned, reasonable and appeals to the primary sources of his speeches. Thus his assertions can be tested. They might be more reliable than an account written twenty years later might suggest.</i></p> <p>In terms of <b>military leadership, Source D supports</b> the hypothesis when it says 'I thought his genius military'.</p> <p>In terms of <b>war leadership, Source D challenges</b> the hypothesis because it states that Davis lacked political skills. The rest of the source also challenges the prompt as it shows him as pessimistic and almost defeatist in that he believes slavery will eventually be abolished.</p> <p><i>Source D is written by Davis's wife many years after the events being remembered. It followed her husband's history of the Confederacy. By 1890, when the Democrats had regained control of the South, white Southerners were more confident in the rightness of their 'Lost Cause'. Davis's wife's account was bound to sympathise with her husband and her leadership. Her account does not paint him as a hero. It seems surprisingly honest about his limitations. In these ways it can be seen as reliable.</i></p>	

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Compare and contrast Sources B and C as evidence of how far the British government remained committed to the Covenant of the League of Nations.</b></p> <p><b>Similarities</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both show the UK government being committed to supporting the Covenant of the League.</li> <li>• Both show that the government's commitment reflects and represents the support of the British public for the League</li> </ul> <p><b>Differences</b> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong commitment in Source C vs. conditional commitment in Source B.</li> </ul> <p><i>Both sources come from the British Foreign Secretary and only a few weeks apart. Source B is a private letter, C a public speech. These differences and the changing international context of the summer of 1935 explain the difference between the two. Source B is likely to be the more reliable of the two given its target audience.</i></p>	<b>15</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p><b>‘In 1935, British public opinion was in favour of supporting the League of Nations in taking strong action against Italy.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view?</b></p> <p><b>Analysis and Evaluation:</b></p> <p><b>Source A</b> can be seen as either <b>challenging</b> or <b>supporting</b> the hypothesis. It <b>challenges</b> by asserting that the British press, some honourable exceptions excepted, argues that Italy should not be resisted. The author himself <b>supports</b> strong action against Italy but as a member of the British public. The support argument needs to make this point about the author to be valid.</p> <p><i>The British press would be more in touch with British public opinion than the author of the source. That the author is an academic makes him more out of touch with the public, not a disinterested observer. However, the press might be more of an influence on public opinion than its representation and thus equally inaccurate. However, the need to sell newspapers would ensure that newspapers reflected public views. [It would be interesting to know whether the sales of honourable newspapers, e.g. the News Chronicle rose or fell.] In its argument that the League should act firmly against Italy, Source A is unreliable. The Peace Ballot of 1935 provides supporting evidence.</i></p> <p><b>Source B</b> shows the private side of the Foreign Secretary. It both <b>supports</b> and <b>challenges</b> the hypothesis. In support, Hoare states that ‘public opinion is hardening against Italy.’ A few lines later, however, he states that the people ‘are anxious to keep out of war’, even though they support the League. Insofar as ‘strong action’ can involve action short of war, the two statements are not wholly inconsistent. [Hoare uses the latter statement to justify the UK’s pragmatic appeasement of Italy.] Candidates can use Source B to argue either way.</p> <p><i>Source B is a confidential letter from the Foreign Secretary to a British diplomat. It is likely to be an accurate statement of the British’s government’s views, though not necessarily the British public’s. Hoare is almost certainly uses his assessment of public opinion to support and justify government policies. In terms of public opinion, Source B is unreliable.</i></p> <p><b>Source C</b> shows the public side of Samuel Hoare. It is very different from Source B in describing government policy. When it comes to explaining British public opinion, Source C shows the public [= ‘my country’ and ‘the British nation’] more willing to consider strong action against acts of aggression – which in this case must mean Italy, even though it is not mentioned by name. Thus <b>Source C supports the assertion</b>.</p> <p><i>Source C is a public speech to the League of Nations in September 1935. These three facts alone make it unreliable as a statement about British public opinion. Speaking to the League on behalf of one of its founding members, Hoare is going to show British support for the League, both from the government and, more importantly, the people of the UK.</i></p>	<b>25</b>

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
3(b)	<p><b>Source D</b> consists of two brief parts: the first the author's isolationist view of the Abyssinian crisis and secondly his opinion of the speech from which Source C is an extract. Neither mention the British public. The first paragraph is more relevant, being the view of a member of the British public and one who, as an MP, should be in touch with that public. [Samuel Hoare is also an MP but, as the key government minister, more concerned with government policy than public opinion.] Thus <b>Source D challenges</b> the assertion.</p> <p><i>Diaries, being private, are usually more reliable than public sources. This diary extract might be seen as a less reliable indicator of public opinion. His view of the crisis is very much his asserted opinion, backed with no supporting evidence. His judgement of Hoare's speech, labelling a self-serving speech as 'terrific' raises further questions about Channon's judgement. From this we can deduce that Channon was a Conservative MP. Being an MP might make his views of public views more reliable but in the 1930s most MPs took little trouble to keep in touch with their constituents. As an expression of public opinion, Source D is unreliable.</i></p>	