
HISTORY

9389/01

Paper 1

For Examination from 2015

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour

MAXIMUM MARK: 40

This document consists of **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.

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]

Section A: European Option

Liberalism and Nationalism in Italy and Germany, 1848–1871

Support for the Unification of Italy

Indicative content

- (a) To what extent do Sources C and D agree about the extent of support for the unification in Italy? [15]**

Sources C and D present sharp contrasts in their accounts of attitudes in Italy towards unification. Source C welcomes the new unity wholeheartedly. Victor Emmanuel I associates unity with liberalism. The Pope (who might be identified by candidates as Pius IX) is completely opposed. His grounds are narrow: unification in a secular state is a challenge to Papal authority in Italy. Candidates should be given credit when they explain the context. The kingdom meant the success of a monarchy over a republic. However, unification was also a triumph for Piedmont-Sardinia. After this brief period of liberalism, Pius IX reverted to a very conservative stance. Source C also claims that Italians should be proud of the support that the new kingdom has from most of Europe. It will play an important part in Europe as the representative of civilised values. The focus of Source D is narrower but candidates can use their own knowledge to point out that the Pope, as well as having a major role in Italy, was an important international figure because many countries were Catholic.

- (b) ‘Unification was more a success for Piedmont’s ambitions than for Italian nationalism.’ How far do these sources and your own knowledge support this judgement? [25]**

Analysis: In Source A, Cavour speaks as the Prime Minister of Piedmont. He refers back to the (failed) policies of Charles Albert, King of Piedmont, and ignores other nationalists. He sees intervention in the Crimean War as more a victory for Piedmont than for Italy as a whole. In Source B, France gives its support to Piedmont but the limited extent is implied by Napoleon’s opposition to revolutionary movements in Italy. It is likely that he includes Mazzini and Garibaldi among these. Source D is a hostile view that focuses on Piedmont’s unwarranted ambitions. On the other hand, in Source C, Victor Emmanuel sees himself as the leader of Italy as a whole.

Evaluation: Source A has value as the statement of a leading statesman which accurately reflects his views at the time and later. Source B can be supported by the limited actions of Napoleon III later but he did have a wider view of a united Italy. Source C is a speech intended to celebrate the new kingdom. It is persuasive rather than informative. Source D can be accepted as an accurate view of Pope Pius IX’s attitude to a united Italy headed by a secular government.

Contextual knowledge: Each of the sources provided an opportunity to use supporting or contrasting own knowledge. Source A allows for a brief discussion of the impact of the Crimean War and links to French intervention after Villafranca in Source B. The extent of a united Italy in 1861 arises from Source C and Pope Pius IX’s changing views can be linked to Source D.

Section B: American Option

The Origins of the Civil War, 1846–1861

The Development of the Republican Party, 1858–1860

Indicative content

- (a) To what extent do Sources A and B agree on the issues on which the Republican Party fought as a national party in the period 1858–60? [15]**

There is an important difference of emphasis between the two; Source A shows that slavery was the issue which galvanised the Republicans while Source B emphasises the maintenance of the Union. Source B does refer to Free Homes and Free Territories, which alludes to the slavery issue. Thus there is some agreement between the sources. Source B is headed 'The Union must and shall be preserved', which could also allude to slavery but shows the focus is more on the Union than on slavery. The two Republican candidates dominate the poster while the slogan 'Protection to American Industry' is as prominent as 'Free Territories'. Thus there is some implicit, but little explicit, agreement between the two sources.

- (b) 'The Republican party was first and foremost an anti-slavery party.' How far do these sources support this assertion? [25]**

Analysis: Evidence for the assertion includes Source A and Source D. Source A, from within the Republican party, and probably from its abolitionist wing, concentrates wholly on slavery while Source D quotes a leading Republican arguing that 'the mission' of the Republicans was to oppose the expansion of slavery. Sources B and C do not put slavery at the forefront of Republican policies. Source C is more concerned with corruption in Washington DC while Source B makes no explicit reference to slavery whatsoever.

Context: Slavery certainly became a leading national issue in the late 1850s and the months prior to the 1860 elections. The Supreme Court's ruling on *Dred Scott* in 1857 was seen by many moderates as well as radicals as upsetting the careful balance between slave and free states. John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry and his subsequent execution in late 1859 gave the issue even greater prominence. The Republican party was a Northern party, as shown by the 1860 election results, and the North wanted the expansion of US industry by policies such as tariffs and a transcontinental railroad, as best shown by policies it implemented when in power during the civil war.

Evaluation:

The sources which support the assertion are limited but in different ways. Source A probably comes from a section of the party and cannot claim to represent the whole party. Source D comes from a Southern source, which is bound to exaggerate the Republican threat to slave power. Thus neither is fully reliable. Of the sources less slavery-focused, Source C comes from New York, where slavery was not an immediate issue while Source B is an election poster which is likely to play down divisive issues such as slavery in the hope of attracting more votes. Thus all sources have their limitations in relation to the hypothesis.

Section C: International Option

The Search for International Peace and Security, 1919–1945

The USA and the League of Nations

Indicative Content

- (a) Compare and contrast the views of President Wilson (Source B) and Senator Borah (Source C) on the issue of whether the USA should join the League of Nations. [15]**

American involvement in WWI had been unpopular in the USA and the two sources reflect opposing views of how such involvement might be prevented in the future. Democratic President Wilson, a liberal idealist, believed that the League of Nations offered the best way to secure future world peace, and had made it a fundamental part of his Fourteen Points regarding the post-war peace treaties. Republican Senator Borah, a devout nationalist, believed that the League of Nations would encourage states to ‘meddle’ in each other’s affairs, making future wars more likely; he was keen to ensure that the USA returned to a policy of strict isolationism. Both sources are political speeches, effectively part of the post-war election campaign, and this is reflected in the emotional/moral content (e.g. Wilson argues that the USA owes a debt to those Americans who fought and died in WWI by ensuring ‘that there never was such a war again’; Borah argues that it is in the interests of both the USA and the whole world for the USA to be ‘permitted to live her own life’).

- (b) How far do the sources support the view that prospects of future world peace would be seriously threatened by the USA’s refusal to join the League of Nations? [25]**

Sources B and D support the hypothesis, Sources A and C challenge it. Senators Henry Cabot Lodge (Source A) and William Borah (Source C) were Republicans who opposed Democratic President Wilson’s liberal idealism. They were both nationalistic and in favour of America’s return to isolationism, resisting any attempt to involve the USA in international political matters. They believed that the USA would be weakened by such involvement, arguing that this would be to the detriment of prospects of future world peace. In their speeches, both use emotional language to enhance their case – e.g. the use of words such as ‘entangled’, ‘dabbling’, ‘meddling and muddling’. Wilson (Source B) also uses emotional language in his speech, arguing that the League of Nations offered the best opportunity for future world peace, something which the USA owed to those Americans who fought in WWI. Wilson claims that the League of Nations was bound to fail without the support of all of the great powers, including the USA. The cartoon (Source D) shares this view, seeing American involvement as especially important, the keystone of the League of Nations’ bridge.

It could be argued, for example, that Sources A and C provide the most convincing argument – President Wilson was naive in assuming that the great nations would really be able to solve their problems without recourse to aggression, especially since neither the defeated powers of WWI (e.g. Germany) nor the USSR were permitted to join the League of Nations. The American people, believing that the USA’s involvement in WWI had been a disaster, were keen to avoid future involvement in international political affairs, as reflected in their eventual rejection of the peace settlements in general and the League of Nations in particular. Conversely, it could be argued that Sources B and D provide the most convincing argument – while Sources A, B and C reflect American political campaigning at the end of WWI, the cartoon (Source D) is a more independent source, depicting a British reaction to the USA’s reluctance to join the League of Nations. The USA is depicted as affluent, selfish and nonchalant, showing no consideration for her European allies, all of whom are committed to the League, nor for the attempt to secure future world peace. The cartoonist believes that the League of Nations is bound to fail without the support of its strongest advocate.

BLANK PAGE